

Binding

BY 11 31

The Department of State

bulletin

Vol. XXIV, No. 616

April 23, 1951

**LIBYA—SYMBOL OF HOPE FOR A NEW ERA IN
NORTH AFRICA • Exchange of Remarks Between
Ambassador Clark and Prime Minister Shuqishli** 643

**THE CHOICES CONFRONTING US IN KOREA •
Remarks by Assistant Secretary Rusk** 655

**COMPULSORY JURISDICTION OF THE INTERNA-
TIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE • Notes by Denys P.
Meyer** 664



For index see back cover



The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XXIV, No. 616 • PUBLICATION 4193

April 23, 1951

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (July 29, 1949).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

Libya—Symbol of Hope for a New Era in North Africa

EXCHANGE OF REMARKS BETWEEN AMBASSADOR CLARK AND PRIME MINISTER SHAQISHLI

[Released to the press April 12]

Following is the exchange of remarks between Ambassador Lewis Clark, United States representative on the United Nations Council for Libya, and Muhammad Shaqishli, the Prime Minister of Cyrenaica, on the occasion of Ambassador Clark's presentation to the King Designate of Libya, Amir al-Sayyid Idris al Sanusi, on April 10 at Benghazi, Cyrenaica.

TEXT OF AMBASSADOR CLARK'S REMARKS

Mr. Prime Minister, Gentlemen: First I should like to express my appreciation of the kind remarks that have just been made by His Excellency the Prime Minister. The words of friendship and of welcome he has voiced I take to be a token of the sentiments of the Cyrenaican Government and people for the Government and people of my country.¹ I should like to reciprocate, if I may, and express at the outset to you and through you to the Libyan people the strong sentiments of friendship and affection which I and my Government feel toward the Libyan people. It has been a real privilege to work in Tripoli with such outstanding Cyrenaicans as Ali Bey Jerbi, my colleague on the United Nations Council, Omar Bey Shanib, Vice President of the National Assembly and Minister of Defense of the Libyan Government and Khalil Bey Galal, and others, to name only a few. I am glad, therefore, of the opportunity once again to have the privilege of visiting Cyrenaica itself and of seeing for myself that you have many more sons of capabilities and charm equal to those you have sent to Tripoli.

I have looked forward to this visit because I know from experience that the traditional hospitality of the East has never been more clearly exemplified than here in Cyrenaica. When I was here before I felt that I was one of you. I sin-

cerely hope that my assumption is justified. I find your people sympathetic. You laugh at the same things at which I laugh and weep on similar occasions. I have looked forward also to this opportunity to tell Your Excellency and the people of Cyrenaica that the Government and the people of the United States are deeply interested in the future of the Libyan state.

We are all keenly aware that in Libya today we are participating in developments of supreme significance not only to Libya but to the world at large. A great experiment is being conducted here. You gentlemen are more fully aware than most that the United Nations was founded only 5 years ago. That historic organization was dedicated, among other things, to an abiding principle—respect for the dignity of the human being. In that principle lies the fundamental difference between Soviet communism and civilization as we know it in my country and, for that matter, in all countries outside the Soviet Union and its satellites. It is the principle on which both Christianity and Islam are founded. All of us are privileged to share the conviction—ingrained in our minds through centuries of religious development—that the individual is not destined to serve the state but that the state is created to serve the individuals. It is respect for the dignity of the individual that distinguishes us from those who have come under Soviet dominance. It was that community of conviction which found us fighting together in the recent war against the similarly alien Fascist and Nazi philosophies and now that our convictions with the help of God have triumphed, it is only fitting that the United Nations should in every way possible help the people of Libya to establish a sovereign and democratic nation.

It is also fitting that my country, the United States of America, should play a leading part in assisting the Libyan people to achieve a stable and lasting independence. I should like to repeat that

¹ Cyrenaica is one of the parts of the proposed Libyan federation. Under United Nations aegis, a provisional Government of Libya has been established in anticipation of Libya's independence by January 1, 1952.

the founding of a Libyan state is a historic experiment. Already in the five short years since the United Nations Organization was founded, at least nine new independent states have come into being. We all hope and we believe that Libya will very soon take her rightful place in their midst. Libya is unique, however, in that it is the first country for which the United Nations has declared itself specifically responsible. Libyan independence has been earned by the efforts of Libyan patriots, but in the preservation of that independence and in the steady elevation of Libya's standard of life the United Nations has assumed special responsibilities and has sent, and will continue to send, men highly qualified in all fields to carry out those responsibilities.

No one can fail to recognize that Libya will be faced with more problems than most countries. There are few known natural resources and distances between its centers of population are great—great even as they were in my country in its early days of independence. I should like to digress here for a moment, if I may, to say that in the early days of my country the framers of our Constitution found it necessary to require a lapse of 4 months' time between the election of our President and his assumption of office solely to permit him to travel from his home to the seat of government.

There are many other similarities between the problems which confront the framers of your constitution today and those which confronted the fathers of my country. But I shall not go into those today. Our task and your task will not be easy. Nevertheless, the goal of my country, and I am sure the goal of the United Nations is the same, is to see growing up in Libya a stable and peace-loving nation where there will be steadily increasing economic well-being and where every citizen can be sure that his hopes and his holy prerogatives are recognized.

Since I last came to Cyrenaica, much has happened. The National Assembly has met and made great progress with its tasks. His Highness the Amir has been acclaimed King of the future state. A provisional federal government has been named, and, already, the powers of state are being transferred to the Libyans themselves in accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly. Much credit in this, it seems to me, is due to the spirit of friendly cooperation that has so happily been demonstrated by our mutual friends in the United Kingdom, in France, and in Italy. The readiness of the administering powers, both the United Kingdom and France, to facilitate in every appropriate way the transfer of powers to the provisional government that has been established and the visits here to Benghazi of the representatives on our council of France and of Italy have given, it seems to me, evidence on the part of those powers not only of good will toward the Libyan state but also of friendship for

His Highness the Amir and of confidence in the ability of His Highness to conduct the affairs of an independent Libya wisely, efficiently and in a manner best serving the interests of all of the people of Libya.

I shall look forward, therefore, to the final steps in the constitutional development program, to the drawing up of the constitution, the declaration of independence, and the assumption of the throne by His Highness the Amir as King of the Libyan nation.

For its part, the United States is eager to witness that great event and to welcome a new friend into the family of nations. Libya was 2,000 years ago the site of a great culture and 1,200 years the site of another. Let us hope that we are on the threshold of a new era in North Africa. It is fitting at this time to pay tribute to the Libyan patriots who did not live to see their country take its place as an independent nation. Were they alive today, I am sure they would be proud of the nation which is being born and of the man who has been selected by the Libyans to be their ruler. I should like once again, therefore, to express to you and through you to His Highness the Amir the sincere friendship of the Government and people of the United States for the Government and people of Libya and our most sincere hope and anticipation that the future will, under the wise guidance of His Highness, witness a steady improvement in the well-being and happiness of the Libyan people.

TEXT OF PRIME MINISTER SHAQISHLI'S REMARKS

Your Excellency and Gentlemen: It is a great honour and pleasure to have Mr. Clark, Ambassador of the United States of America, amongst us as guest of His Majesty the King in the capital of Cyrenaica.

The people of Cyrenaica have been eagerly awaiting this auspicious visit in order to welcome one who is liked and admired all over Libya, one of our closest friends and one who has devoted his energies honestly and sincerely in serving the cause of our country and in helping our people to move forward toward constitutional reform, a matter the people themselves chose and planned of their own free will according to the decision of the United Nations Organization.

The time spent by you in Libya, during which you were the interpreter of friendly feelings of the American people, a fact proved on many an occasion by different aspects of kindness and friendliness toward the Libyan people, must have given you a true impression of feelings of our people to your own people and of our people's aspirations toward a free, democratic and independent life, a life of dignity and self-respect, a life in which a nation can plan its own future

for itself under the aegis of our beloved King, the symbol of our aspirations and protector of our Fatherland.

Your Excellency will no doubt have noticed how a young Libyan people is striving to awake from its slumber and is shaking off the dust of a hated past. Your Excellency will also have admired this people's longing to achieve their objective and their devotion to their King, and their sacrifices to achieve their national aims, with a view to enjoyment of freedom and independence, and in order to play their part with free nations in the establishment of world peace.

Your Excellency, the Libyan people, being guardians of a great legacy of extreme spiritual value, believe it to be a heresy to deny the truth of such a spiritual legacy, a heresy which must be fought. With such a belief it finds itself nearest to the free democratic nations and is proud of their close friendship, first among which is its friendship with the generous American nation. This friendship has emerged as a result of honourably defending a sacred cause, a responsibility which the gallant American nation has now assumed with all their tremendous potentialities in the vanguard of all free nations in the defence of the free world and of the true democratic principles which are now endangered by the greatest menace history ever knew.

Your Excellency, we appreciate the noble feelings of the American people and admire their devotion to their humanitarian duty. Despite their safety at home and the fact that they need not fear others, since of their own ample strength they can defend themselves against any attack, this noble and humanitarian feeling caused them to adopt an active role in combatting this danger which is threatening world peace, and induced them to leave their homeland and their security, so as to take the responsibility of fulfilling a sublime historical mission. A mission, the banner of which is being carried by most of the free nations, including especially the people of the United Kingdom, who are also defending this sublime principle.

What causes rejoicing, however, is that the world is witnessing today signs of joint cooperation between the American nation and the rest of the free nations of the world to cope with the present critical situation which requires an immense effort on the part of the big democratic powers so as to prevent a third world war which may shake the foundations of our present civilization. And what brings confidence is the prevailing belief that the establishment of a spirit of cooperation and the strengthening of such a spirit between the great democratic powers and the rest of the free nations is the best guarantee for the safety of the free world and the preservation of the principles for which they stand from the threat of any danger, especially at this critical period, in which the forces of the free nations come under the banner of the United Nations organiza-

tion, are waging a fierce struggle in support of a free life: Free from fear, and free from humiliation for the coming generations. We also firmly believe that as long as the free nations entertain such a belief, and are confident of the energies and potentialities of the big democratic powers, then no danger whatsoever can threaten independence and freedom and the ways of life and thinking of the free world. We are full of hope that the sun of that day, in which the United Nations forces will be able to restore peace, will shine in the very near future.

Your Excellency, may I, in my capacity as Prime Minister of the Cyrenaican Government, and with this true faith and this shining hope, welcome you heartily as a guest of our King, and extend to you on behalf of the Cyrenaican people, a sincere and friendly greeting, trusting that Your Excellency may have a happy sojourn amongst us. For my part, I extend to the generous American people my best wishes and regards.

And lastly, may I conclude this speech by wishing a long life to our King Idris the Great and to President Truman, the honourable President of a friendly state, and may long friendship reign between our two peoples.

May peace and mercy of God be upon you.

THE CONGRESS

Legislation

- Amending the Tariff Act of 1930 so as To Extend to Flaxseed and Linseed and Flaxseed and Linseed Oil the Privilege of Substitution for Drawback of Duties. H. Rept. 27, 82d Cong. 1st sess. [To accompany H. R. 2192] 2 pp.
- Granting of Permanent Residence to Certain Aliens. H. Rept. 91, 82d Cong. 1st sess. [To accompany H. Con. Res. 49] 57 pp.
- Providing for the Expeditious Naturalization of Former Citizens of the United States Who Have Lost United States Citizenship Through Voting in a Political Election or in a Plebiscite Held in Italy. H. Rept. 92, 82d Cong. 1st sess. [To accompany H. R. 400] 8 pp.
- Providing the Privilege of Becoming a Naturalized Citizen of the United States to All Aliens Having a Legal Right to Permanent Residence. H. Rept. 93, 82d Cong. 1st sess. [To accompany H. R. 403] 4 pp.
- Clarifying the Immigration Status of Certain Aliens. H. Rept. 118, 82d Cong. 1st sess. [To accompany H. R. 2339] 6 pp.
- Background Information on the Use of United States Armed Forces in Foreign Countries. Report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs pursuant to H. Res. 28, a resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee. H. Rept. 127, 82d Cong. 1st sess. vii, 77 pp.
- Suspension of Deportation of Certain Aliens. H. Rept. 158, 82d Cong. 1st sess. [To accompany S. Con. Res. 6] 2 pp. Also, H. Rept. 159, 82d Cong. 1st sess. [To accompany S. Con. Res. 7] 2 pp.

(Continued on page 663)

U.S. Reiterates Demand to U.S.S.R. on Lend-Lease Settlement

Following is an exchange of notes between the Secretary of State and the Soviet Ambassador to Washington concerning the request of the United States Government of February 7, 1951, that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics promptly return to the United States all vessels loaned to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics under the terms of the master lend-lease agreement of June 11, 1942.

UNITED STATES NOTE OF APRIL 6

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to your note No. 22 of March 21, 1951 concerning this Government's request of February 7, 1951 that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics promptly return to the United States all vessels loaned to the Soviet Union under the terms of the Master Lend-Lease Agreement of June 11, 1942.

In your note you declare that agreement had already been reached between our two Governments for the sale to the Soviet Union of all the merchant ships and part of the naval ships received under Lend-Lease and that this Government's note of February 7, 1951 "violates" this agreement.

By "agreement" it is presumed that you have reference to this Government's notes of February 27, 1948, September 3, 1948 and August 8, 1949 which dealt with the disposition of lend-lease vessels.¹

With respect to the thirty-six war-built merchant vessels this Government's note of February 27, 1948 stated:

The agreement of your Government concerning these vessels resolves tentatively one of the several points necessary to a satisfactory comprehensive settlement of the obligations under the agreement between our two Governments of June 11, 1942.

... Your attention is invited to the fact that at the first meeting of the Working Groups on May 3, 1947, United States Representatives stated that since the object of the negotiations was to achieve a satisfactory comprehensive settlement, agreement reached on any particular subject was tentative and subject to agreement on all issues necessary to a general settlement. The Soviet representatives indicated their concurrence. Accordingly, the first paragraph of the *Outline of Main*

Points of Settlement Proposed by the United States Side in keeping with the above-mentioned understandings reached by the representatives of our two Governments on May 3, 1947 reads in part as follows: "As both sides have understood from the outset, the reaching of agreement upon any one issue is tentative and subject to the conclusion of a satisfactory comprehensive settlement."

With respect to pre-war-built merchant vessels and tugs, this Government's note of August 8, 1949 stated in part:

The Government of the United States considers this amount (\$13,000,000) satisfactory as the cash price for the sale of the vessels, effective as of September 2, 1945, it being understood that the sale will be consummated only upon conclusion of the over-all Lend-Lease settlement. Agreement on this point resolves satisfactorily another of the several points of a comprehensive settlement, but the Government of the United States will continue to reserve its rights under Article V of the agreement of June 11, 1942, to require the return to the United States of the pre-war-built merchant vessels and the tugs as well as other Lend-Lease articles until such time as a mutually satisfactory over-all settlement agreement is reached.

With respect to naval vessels, this Government's note of September 3, 1948 stated in part:

Provided a mutually satisfactory Lend-Lease settlement is promptly agreed upon by our two Governments, the Government of the United States is willing, at agreed prices, to sell to the Soviet Government as a part of such settlement and in accordance with the surplus property procedures outlined to representatives of your Government on June 25, 1947, the following naval craft . . .

Moreover, on other occasions this Government has made perfectly clear to the Soviet Government its position concerning the disposition of lend-lease vessels. In this Government's note of May 7, 1948 which referred to the conditional nature of the agreement concerning war-built merchant ships as set forth in this Government's note of February 27, 1948, it was stated:

... the position of the Government of the United States is that, if a comprehensive lend-lease settlement is not concluded promptly, the Government of the United States under Article V of the Agreement of June 11, 1942, will require the return to the United States of the lend-lease merchant vessels now remaining in the possession of your government.

In this Government's note of September 3, 1948 in connection with the need for a prompt and satisfactory settlement, it was stated:

¹ Not printed.

Therefore, notwithstanding certain offers which this Government has made in connection with its settlement proposals, unless a mutually satisfactory settlement is promptly agreed upon by our two Governments, this Government will have no alternative but to withdraw its offers to transfer full title to certain lend-lease articles to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and will be obliged to exercise its rights under Article V of the Agreement of June 11, 1942 by requiring the return of such articles to the United States. This is particularly applicable to all merchant and naval vessels. It applies also to military vessels and to certain other lend-lease articles which would be of use to the United States.

From the above it is clear that the agreement referred to in your note of March 21, 1951 consists of a series of tentative offers by the Government of the United States which have been explicitly conditioned upon the conclusion of a prompt and satisfactory lend-lease settlement. In the current conversations on the subject of a lend-lease settlement, Ambassador John C. Wiley has repeatedly called to your attention the fact that the Soviet Government by avoiding the reaching of a prompt and satisfactory over-all settlement clearly has failed to meet the conditions for the sale of any of these vessels. Therefore, this Government is free to withdraw its conditional offer to sell such vessels and this was done in this Government's note of February 7, 1951.

Your note of March 21, 1951 advances as a second reason for not returning lend-lease vessels the argument that the vessels are not needed by the United States. Article V of the Master Lend-Lease Agreement of June 11, 1942 is clear and specific on this point, reading as follows:

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will return to the United States of America at the end of the present emergency, as determined by the President of the United States of America, such defense articles transferred under this agreement as shall not have been destroyed, lost or consumed and as shall be determined by the President to be useful in the defense of the United States of America or of the Western Hemisphere or to be otherwise of use to the United States of America.

This article places upon the President of the United States alone the responsibility for the determination of the usefulness of lend-lease articles to the United States. The point raised in your note of March 21, 1951 that certain vessels of the United States may have been disposed of to third countries bears no relationship to the obligations of your Government under Article V and is not subject to discussion between our two Governments.

On July 7, 1948 the President of the United States of America determined that the emergency relative to the lend-lease program had been terminated and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was so notified on October 7, 1948. On this date the Soviet Government was also notified of the determination by the President of the United States that 3 icebreakers, 28 frigates and 186 other naval craft were of use to the United

States and their return was demanded. The Soviet Government has returned only the frigates and one icebreaker. On February 7, 1951 the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was informed that the President of the United States of America had determined that all merchant, military and naval lend-lease vessels remaining in Soviet custody are of use to the United States and the prompt return of these vessels was duly demanded. Therefore, the obligation of the Soviet Government to return the vessels listed in this Government's note of February 7, 1951 is clear and unequivocal.

With reference to the statement in your note of March 21, 1951 that United States naval vessels in Soviet custody are "badly worn out and for the most part unfit for navigation in the open sea," I wish to emphasize that title to these vessels remains in the Government of the United States regardless of their condition. I therefore repeat the request made in this Government's note of February 7, 1951 that representatives of the Government of the United States be permitted to examine all unserviceable vessels in order to determine their ultimate disposition.

The demand presented in this Government's note of February 7, 1951, that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics immediately return to the Government of the United States all the naval and merchant vessels as well as military watercraft which were transferred to it under the Master Lend-Lease Agreement of June 11, 1942 is hereby reiterated.

A prompt reply is requested in order that the necessary arrangements for return may be promptly agreed upon with the Soviet naval expert now in Washington.

Accept [etc.]

DEAN ACHESON

SOVIET NOTE OF MARCH 21

WASHINGTON, *March 21, 1951*

SIR: In connection with your note delivered to me on February 7, 1951 by Mr. Wiley during the negotiations on the question of a Lend-Lease settlement, I have the honor to state the following:

As you know, by agreement between the Governments of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. negotiations were renewed in Washington on January 15 this year between representatives of both Governments for settling all Lend-Lease accounts. Prior to that time agreement had already been reached between the Governments of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. on several specific questions of the Lend-Lease settlement, and several other specific questions remained to be agreed upon in order to complete the negotiations and to conclude an agreement for a final and total settlement. In particular, an agreement was reached concerning

the sale to the Soviet Union of all the merchant ships and part of the naval ships received under Lend-Lease. With regard to merchant ships, an agreement was also reached about sale prices and that the value of all merchant ships of pre-war construction would be paid for in cash. It is important to note that the agreement concerning the sale of merchant ships to the Soviet Union was reached long before the expiration of the Act of 1946 concerning the sale of merchant ships. As concerns the naval vessels, it is well known that the Government of the U.S.S.R., in view of the agreement which had been reached earlier, sent a naval expert to Washington at the suggestion of the Government of the U.S.A., proceeding on the basis that the American and Soviet experts would discuss the conditions of the sale of naval vessels to the Soviet Union.

The proposal for the immediate return of all merchant and naval vessels, made by the Government of the U.S.A. in your note of February 7 of this year, violates the agreement already reached between the Governments of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. during the negotiations on Lend-Lease.

The United States Government attempts to justify its violation of the agreement concerning the sale to the Soviet Union of all merchant vessels and part of the naval vessels by referring to Article 5 of the Lend-Lease Agreement of June 11, 1942, which stipulates the possibility of the return of Lend-Lease residue at the determination of the President of the United States. However, in this case the question concerns solely the fulfillment by the Government of the U.S.A. of an agreement which had been reached after the conclusion of the Agreement of June 11, 1942 and which fully corresponds to the principles and tasks of this agreement, which provides for the necessity of guaranteeing the interests of both sides in the final Lend-Lease settlement.

It is necessary to note that the Government of the U.S.A. motivates its proposal, concerning the return of the merchant and naval vessels received by the Soviet Union under Lend-Lease, by the fact that the United States has need of these vessels at the present time. This motivation cannot but cause surprise.

The United States demands the return by the Soviet Union of an insignificant number of merchant vessels while according to the report of the Senate Commission of August 30, 1950, No. 2494, three-fifths of all tonnage or more than 15 million gross tons of the United States merchant fleet are not being used and are moored inactive at piers.

The United States also demands the return by the Soviet Union of an insignificant number of small naval vessels badly worn out and for the most part unfit for navigation in the open sea. Meanwhile it is well known that the United States has sold and transferred several naval vessels to other countries. Thus, according to data of the U.S.

Department of Defense published in a press release of January 9, 1951, two light cruisers were sold to Brazil and Chile; according to reports in the American press, destroyer escorts, submarines and other naval vessels were sold to Turkey, Greece, France and other countries. Altogether according to data published in the United States twenty-six large naval vessels were sold to other countries in 1950 and 1951, not to mention a considerable number of small naval vessels. With regard to the sale of merchant vessels, as can be seen from data published on January 18 of this year in the American press the United States has sold 1,113 American vessels of war-time construction to foreign purchasers.

It is also known that during the Lend-Lease settlement with Great Britain, the Government of the U.S.A. sold vessels, along with other Lend-Lease residual items, to the Government of Great Britain, as is witnessed by the report of the Senate Commission of March 22, 1946, No. 110, section V.

Thus the reference in your note to the fact that the United States needs merchant and naval vessels appears to have an artificial character and therefore cannot serve as a basis for presenting the Soviet Union with a demand to return all Lend-Lease vessels. Such a demand does not conform to the principles of the Lend-Lease Agreement, which provides, as is well known, an obligation to consider the interests of both sides and not to act unilaterally and to the harm of these interests.

The Soviet Government also considers it necessary to draw the attention of the Government of the U.S.A. to the fact that the number of Lend-Lease naval vessels indicated in the supplement to your note of February 7 does not correspond to the actual number of such vessels in the possession of the Soviet Union. The total number of available Lend-Lease naval vessels in the U.S.S.R. is 498, not counting two icebreakers. The remaining 56 vessels were lost during military operations and for other reasons. On June 25, 1948 the Soviet Government, as is known, reported the existence in the U.S.S.R. of 518 naval vessels, consisting mainly of cutters, minesweepers and other small vessels, without mentioning the remaining vessels which were lost during the war.

In its note of reply of September 3, 1948, the Government of the U.S.A. correctly listed 36 vessels as lost or destroyed. As concerns 20 vessels, I reported their loss to Mr. Wiley during the negotiations on January 27 of this year. During the negotiations on February 7, additional information concerning Lend-Lease naval vessels now in the U.S.S.R. was given to Mr. Wiley.

The Soviet Government expresses confidence that the Government of the U.S.A. will adhere to the agreement previously reached concerning merchant and naval vessels, which is an important condition in reaching a Lend-Lease settlement.

Accept [etc.]

A. PANYUSHKIN

Analysis of Official Personnel Stationed in the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.

*Text of Letter from Assistant Secretary McFall
to Representative Thomas J. Lane*

March 20, 1951

MY DEAR MR. LANE: Reference is made to your letter of March 1, 1951, acknowledged by telephone on March 9, 1951, forwarding for the Department's comment a copy of the remarks which you made in the House of Representatives on March 1. In these remarks you recommend that the official personnel which the Soviet Government sends to the United States and the travel of this personnel in the United States be placed on a reciprocal basis with regard to the number of official personnel of the United States in the Soviet Union and the travel privileges of American official personnel in that country.

Your remarks refer to two important questions concerning United States-Soviet relations which are under continual consideration in the Department. The comments of the Department with regard to these matters are presented in the following paragraphs.

The exchange of official representatives between two governments is rarely susceptible to treatment on a numerical parity basis. In almost every instance one country or the other will require a larger official establishment. Actually the variety of functions which the American Foreign Service is expected to perform, including complex visa and passport services and a wide range of reporting on political and economic subjects, is so great that the diplomatic and consular offices of the United States in any foreign country tend to be larger than that country's official representation in the United States.

An analysis of the number of Soviet officials in the United States reported to the Department of State by the Soviet Embassy up to March 5, 1951, and comparable American personnel in the Soviet Union as of the same date indicates that Soviet and United States official representation is practically on a parity basis. This analysis includes Embassy officials, correspondents, and commercial representatives of the two countries. It excludes Soviet representation to international organizations in the United States which have no counterpart in the Soviet Union.

There are enclosed two sheets which present United States official personnel in the Soviet Union and Soviet personnel in the United States as of March 5, 1951. You will note that the Soviet list carries a comparative list of Soviet personnel in the United States as of July 1, 1950. While on the face of these lists there appears to be a numerical disparity in representation in favor of the Soviet Union, an analysis of the figures gives a different picture. On March 5 the United States Government had official personnel numbering 101 with 16 dependents assigned to the American Embassy in Moscow. The Soviet counterpart of this figure is official Soviet personnel numbering 88, with 125 dependents (70 wives and 55 children) assigned to the Soviet Embassy in Washington. Thus, the United States has 13 more official employees in the American Embassy in Moscow than the Soviet Government has in the Soviet Embassy in Washington. Since no international organization of which the United States is a member has its headquarters in the Soviet Union, there can be no United States personnel in the Soviet Union comparable to the Soviet personnel assigned to the United Nations; namely, 121 (52 official employees, 38 wives, 31 children). If from the 381 total Soviet official personnel in the United States, there is subtracted 121, which is the Soviet representation, including dependents, to the United Nations, and 153 which represents Soviet dependents in the United States other than dependents of Soviet United Nations employees, the total Soviet official employees in the United States would amount to 107, 6 more than the 101 United States official employees in the Soviet Union, minus dependents.

With regard to Soviet restrictions on the travel of foreigners, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is divided into "free" and prohibited areas for diplomatic and consular personnel of foreign nations in the Soviet Union. Foreign officials on duty in Moscow may not travel more than 50 kilometers from the city limits with the exception of three points of historic interest to which foreigners may travel after appropriate notification to the foreign office. In general, all border areas and all of the central Asian republics, the Caucasus with the exception of Tbilisi, the Baltic States, and the western areas of the Ukraine and

Belorussia including the capital cities of Kiev and Minsk are within the zones prohibited to foreign officials. Although most of the Siberian areas is technically "free," in practice it is greatly restricted owing to the fact that the important cities are forbidden areas. In order to travel to "free" areas foreign missions must notify the foreign office in advance of the name and the itinerary of the traveler. Under this procedure, members of the Embassy's staff in Moscow have been able to make frequent trips to "free" areas during the past 2 years.

The question of applying travel control measures to Soviet official personnel in the United States is under constant review by the United States Government agencies concerned. Restrictions upon the travel of Soviet officials will be imposed whenever it is evident that such action is in the over-all interest of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. McFALL,
Assistant Secretary.

Enclosures: (1) Total United States official personnel in the Soviet Union as of March 5, 1951; (2) total Soviet officials in the United States as of March 5, 1951.

Total United States Official Personnel in the Soviet Union, March 5, 1951

Embassy:	
State Department.....	64
Navy attaché staff.....	13
Army attaché staff.....	18
Air Force attaché staff.....	6
Dependents.....	16
Total.....	117

UNITED STATES NONOFFICIAL PERSONNEL IN THE SOVIET UNION

Clergymen.....	1
Newspaper correspondents.....	6
Businessmen (composed at present of fur buyers— an approximation).....	2
Total.....	9
Grand total.....	126

Breakdown of figures used in the compilation "Total United States official personnel in the Soviet Union March 5, 1951," attached hereto:

State Department:	
Male employees including Ambassador:	
Foreign Service officer.....	15
Foreign Service Reserve officer.....	1
Foreign service staff personnel.....	25
Female employees, unmarried (Foreign Service staff).....	
Working wives (Foreign Service staff).....	15
Total working personnel.....	64
Dependents (nonworking—includes 2 wives and 9 children).....	
Total State Department.....	75

Navy Department:	
Naval officers.....	5
Enlisted men.....	8
Total.....	13
Dependents (2 wives included in "working wives" above and 1 daughter included in "female employees, unmarried" above—1 dependent child).....	
Total Navy Department.....	14
Department of the Army:	
Officers.....	5
Warrant officers.....	1
Enlisted men.....	12
Total.....	18
Dependents (2 wives included in "working wives" above; 2 dependent wives).....	
Total Army.....	20
Air Force:	
Officers.....	3
Enlisted men.....	3
Total.....	6
Dependents (1 wife included in "working wives" above; 1 wife and 1 dependent child).....	
Total for Air Force.....	8
Grand total.....	117

Soviet Officials in United States¹

	Comparative figures	
	Mar. 5, 1951 ¹	July 1, 1950
SUMMARY		
Embassy personnel	88	² 86
International organizations	52	59
Purchasing Commission	2	2
Tass	7	7
Pravda correspondents	2	2
Amtorg	7	17
Correspondents of All-Union Radio Committee of U.S.S.R.	1	1
Wives	124	132
Children	98	103
Dependent relative	0	1
Grand total ³	381	410
BREAKDOWN		
Embassy of the U.S.S.R.:		
Accredited officers of Embassy	40	39
Employees of Embassy	48	47
Subtotal	88	86
Wives of Embassy officers	32	31
Wives of Embassy employees	38	38
Subtotal	70	69

	Comparative figures	
	Mar. 5, 1951 ¹	July 1, 1950
Embassy of the U. S. S. R.—Con.		
Children of Embassy officers . . .	23	24
Children of Embassy employees . .	32	28
Subtotal	55	52
Dependent relative of Embassy personnel	0	1
Total Embassy	213	208
United Nations:		
U.S.S.R. representation to U.N. .	49	55
Wives of U.S.S.R. representatives	35	39
Children	30	37
Subtotal	114	131
U.S.S.R. members Military Staff Committee	3	4
Wives of members of Military Staff Committee	3	4
Children	1	2
Subtotal	7	10
Total United Nations	121	141
Government organizations:		
Purchasing Commission	2	2
Wives of members	2	2
Children	2	2
Subtotal	6	6
Tass employees	7	7
Wives	6	6
Children	5	3
Subtotal	18	16
Pravda correspondents	2	2
Wives	2	1
Children	1	0
Subtotal	5	3
All-Union Radio Committee Correspondents	1	1
Wives	1	1
Children	2	1
Subtotal	4	3
Amorg employees	7	17
Wives	5	10
Children	2	6
Subtotal	14	33
Total governmental organizations	47	61
Grand total	² 381	410

¹ Figures based on note 8 of Jan. 27, 1951, from Soviet Embassy reporting Soviet citizens, employees of Soviet State institutions, Soviet missions, and other organizations to be found in the United States as of Jan. 1, 1951, and note 7 of Jan. 24, 1951, and note 11 of Feb. 7, 1951, which showed further personnel changes.

² Soviet officials in United States as of July 1, 1950. Figures based on note 113 of July 13, 1950. Soviet Embassy reporting Soviet citizens, employees, and other organizations in the United States as of July 1, 1950.

³ In addition to this total, there are 12 Soviet citizens employed by the Secretariat of the United Nations who are accompanied by 12 wives and 6 children (total 30).

Deadline for Filing War Claims With Italy

[Released to the press April 12]

The importance of completing the consideration and adjudication of claims on behalf of American nationals under provisions of the peace treaty with Italy with the least possible delay makes it imperative that a time limit be fixed for the filing of such claims.

Considering that a period of more than 3 years has already elapsed within which such claims could be filed, it has been determined that the date of September 15, 1951, be fixed as the final date for the filing of claims either directly with the American Embassy at Rome or with the Department of State, Legal Adviser's Office, Washington, D.C., for presentation to the Government of the Republic of Italy.

The claims involved are those based upon loss or damage, as a result of the war, to property in Italy which was owned by American nationals.

Since no assurance can be given that it will be possible for claims not filed on or before September 15, 1951, to receive proper consideration, claimants desiring to file claims of the character referred to, but who have not yet done so, are urged to present them as far in advance of the above-mentioned date as possible.

Effect of Revised German Monetary Reform Law on U.N. Nationals

[Released to the press April 12]

The Department of State wishes to direct the attention of United States citizens to an amendment of the monetary reform legislation enacted in Western Germany in June 1948. This amendment is Allied High Commission Law No. 46 and enables United Nations nationals to accept, at the rate of 1 deutschemark for every 10 reichsmarks previously due, payments in deutschemarks of reichsmarks debts owed them by German nationals without waiving their rights to secure whatever future payments there may be to United Nations nationals in the final settlement of such debts. Under the provisions of this law, a United Nations creditor, if he has objected against conversion at the rate stipulated in the currency reform law or has refused a previous tender of deutschemarks, must notify his debtor on or before December 31, 1951, that his refusal of payment is withdrawn.

Under the terms of the 1948 monetary reform legislation in Germany, in general all debts and claims expressed in former reichsmarks were converted into new deutschemark obligations at the rate of 1 deutschemark for every 10 reichsmarks

previously due. Article XV of United States-United Kingdom Military Government Laws Nos. 63 and section XV of French Military Government Ordinance No. 160 provided, however, that United Nations nationals owing claims for the payment of a sum of money arising out of debts expressed in reichsmarks, other than credit balances in financial institutions, could make to their debtors before October 20, 1948, a declaration against conversion of the debt into deutschmarks at the above-mentioned rate of exchange.

Apart from this option of making immediate declaration to their debtors, article XV and section XV also permitted United Nations nationals to refuse a tender of deutschmarks at any time prior to a peace treaty or other agreed settlement of this problem. If a United Nations creditor either objected to the conversion by notification to his debtor or refused to accept a payment when tendered, his rights remain unaffected by the laws and ordinance.

As stated above, the revision of article XV and section XV now permits a United Nations creditor to accept payment of the debt in deutschmarks at the 10 to 1 rate without waiving his right to secure whatever future payments there may be to United Nations nationals under a final settlement of the problem. Such revision further provides that a United Nations creditor, who has objected against conversion at the stipulated rate by a declaration to his debtor or refused a tender of deutschmarks, must notify his debtor on or before December 31, 1951, that his refusal of payment is withdrawn.

Panel of U.S. Women Visit Germany

On April 10, the Department of State and the Office of the United States High Commissioner for Germany announced that a panel of 11 women delegates from national nongovernmental organizations will leave the United States for Germany on April 19 for 6 weeks' work and consultation with German women's organizations. Their travel to and from Germany is being financed by their respective organizations, representing approximately 15,000,000 American women. The Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor has acted as liaison between the Department of State and the various national organizations in planning this joint panel, the first of its kind to represent the United States in Germany. The names of the organizations and their representatives follow:

Organization	Name
League of Women Voters	Mrs. H. E. Dyke
Congress of Industrial Organizations	Mrs. Marie Mengersen
Associated Country Women of the World	Mrs. Philip Jones
Young Women's Christian Association	Mrs. Arthur Anderson

Organization	Name
United Council of Church Women	Miss Luella Reckmeyer
National Council of Negro Women	Dr. Dorothy Ferebee
American Federation of Labor	Mrs. Edna Rose
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.	Dr. Minnie Maffett
American Association of University Women	Mrs. Frederick Gilstrap
National Council of Jewish Women	Mrs. Joseph Willen
National Council of Catholic Women	Mrs. Anthony J. Scholter

The delegates will spend from 5 to 7 days respectively in the vicinity of Frankfurt, Stuttgart, Munich, Berlin, Hamburg, Bonn, and in rural areas of the Federal Republic. At each stopover, the panel will meet with German women's groups and then divide to pursue special interests, such as labor affairs, religious activities, and civic affairs, by working individually with women's organizations and leaders in smaller towns.

The American and German women will exchange ideas concerning mutual problems, the participation of women in civic affairs, and the objectives and functions of national and international women's organizations. The American women will be especially concerned with investigating methods of aiding German-affiliated organizations and other women's groups. They will also visit many of the educational, welfare, and civic projects sponsored by German women's organizations.

The 6-week program is being arranged jointly by the Women's Affairs representatives of the Allied High Commissioners and a committee of representatives of major German women's organizations.

U.S.-Germany Discuss Agreement for VOA German Language Programs

[Released to the press April 12]

The Department of State in a statement released simultaneously today in Washington and Frankfurt announced the opening of negotiations in Germany between the general managers of four German radio stations and the Voice of America for an agreement on the relay of Voice of America German-language programs.

The negotiations are the culmination of requests made several months ago by the German broadcasters for discussions with representatives of the Voice of America on the present Voice German-language programs relayed by the stations in the American zone of Germany. These programs have been rebroadcast as an occupation requirement by the stations Radio Bremen in Bremen, Hessian radios in Frankfurt, South German Radio in Stuttgart, and the Bavarian Radio in Munich.

The Department of State has received, and is considering, proposals made by Eberhard Beckmann, general manager of the Hessian Radio; Fritz Eberhardt, general manager of the South German Radio; Rudolph von Scholz, general manager of the Bavarian Radio; and Walter Geerdes, general manager of Radio Bremen.

*Statement by Howland H. Sargeant
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs*

The negotiations now going on between the German stations and the Voice of America are an eloquent example of free people cooperating wholeheartedly in the international struggle for truthful information. We are happy that through the cooperation of the German broadcasters continued relays of the Voice of America will be possible in a mutually acceptable and beneficial manner. We are particularly happy that through the medium of the Voice of America the German people will continue to receive a complete picture of American thought, action, and culture. The amazing and rapid development of German radio during the occupation into a vital instrument of free expression and thought for all the people of Germany has indeed been gratifying. This latest step in cooperation marks an important milestone in the wholesome relationships between the German and American people. It is a high sign of good will and mutual cooperation in these difficult times. We welcome it as the expression of a free people banded together with us in the Campaign of Truth so necessary in the world today.

VOA To Broadcast in Hebrew

[Released to the press April 10]

The Voice of America will begin a daily 30-minute broadcast in Hebrew on Sunday, April 15, the Department of State announced today.

The initial program will include messages from President Truman; George C. McGhee, Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs; Senator Herbert Lehman; and Abba Eban, Israeli Ambassador to the United States. Subsequent broadcasts will contain news, analysis, features, and music. The features will consist of interviews with Israelis in America, Americana, talks by well-known Israelis and economic, agricultural, labor, scientific, cultural, and dramatic programs.

The new Voice of America program will be broadcast short wave from the United States on four frequencies from 1:00 to 1:30 p.m. e.s.t. (8:00-8:30 p.m. in Israel) and will be relayed by the Voice of America relay base at Tangier.

Sidney Glazer, who has been with the Near East section of the Voice of America and was formerly with the Library of Congress, has been designated chief of the Hebrew unit.

The addition of Hebrew will increase to 30 the number of languages and dialects utilized by the Voice of America in its world-wide broadcasting service.

Also, on April 15, the Voice of America will increase its transmissions in Persian, Spanish to Spain, German to Germany and Portuguese to Brazil, which will increase the total Voice of America service to more than 42 program hours daily.

Point 4 Agreement Signed With Iraq

[Released to the press April 10]

The United States and Iraq today signed a Point 4 general agreement in Baghdad. Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs, Tewfiq Suweidi, signed for Iraq and American Ambassador Edward S. Crocker, for the United States. With the addition of Iraq today, there are now 22 countries which have signed technical cooperation agreements with the United States under the Act for International Development, which authorized President Truman's Point 4 Program.

A request has been approved for the services of an American engineer on the Iraq Development Board, which will study the country's most immediate economic problems and make recommendations for a development program. Requests also have been received for technical assistance in the fields of agricultural education, vocational education, and home economics.

The legendary site of the Garden of Eden, Iraq, is taking action to control the flood waters of the Euphrates and Tigris Rivers to bring the country back to its historic productivity. Irrigation and proper control of these two great rivers can double the area of about 12,500 square miles now under cultivation and make the land now in use more productive.

A 12.8 million dollar loan was negotiated in June 1950 by Iraq from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a flood control project on the Tigris River, and bids have been asked for the work. A project already is under way in the valley of the Euphrates. It is called the Habbaniyah water storage scheme. Each of these projects, when completed, should provide water to irrigate up to a million acres.

About 80 percent of Iraq's 4,800,000 people are farmers. Two crops, barley and dates, contribute 78.4 percent of Iraq's exports, exclusive of oil, and other agricultural products contribute another 16 percent. The principal food imports are tea, coffee, and sugar, none of which can be grown locally in quantity. Aside from these and other minor items, Iraq's people can produce enough to feed themselves. Industrial and agricultural machinery are important items of importation.

Secretary-General Lie Advised of Change in U. N. Command

Letter From Ambassador Austin to Secretary-General Lie

U.N. doc. S/2082
Dated Apr. 11, 1951

11 April 1951

EXCELLENCY: Acting under instructions from my Government, I have the honor to inform the Security Council that the President of the United States has today relieved General Douglas MacArthur as the Commanding General of the military forces which the members of the United Nations have made available to the Unified Command under the United States, pursuant to the Security Council resolution of July 7, 1950, and has designated Lieutenant General Matthew B. Ridgway as his successor.

Request is made that this report be provided to the Security Council.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

WARREN R. AUSTIN

Ambassador Dulles Returns to Japan for Peace Treaty Consultation

Statement by the Ambassador

[Released to the press April 13]

I am flying to Japan to discuss with General Ridgway and Japanese leaders the present state of the Japanese peace treaty. Since our mission left Japan on February 11, good progress has been made, and the President has made abundantly clear his determination that this work shall move forward steadily. That makes it important at this juncture to acquaint General Ridgway with all phases of the matter so that, as Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers in Japan, he can assist in completing the peace which was contemplated by the surrender terms and which is now due. It will also be useful, at this juncture, to advise the Japanese leaders as to the pending state of the negotiations with other Allied Powers. There will be some differences to be ironed out, but nothing that has transpired leads us to doubt the practicability of an early agreement by most of the Allied Powers upon a peace treaty which will, in general, follow the lines indicated in my Los Angeles address of March 31.

Whatever may be the differences of opinion here at home as to other matters, I have found agreement by the leaders of both our political parties that we must proceed without regard to partisan-

ship to strengthen peace and the defense of freedom in the Pacific. That is a result which the American people are unitedly determined to achieve, and I shall contribute to it to the best of my ability.

I am glad to be accompanied by the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Earl D. Johnson and Col. C. Stanton Babcock and Robert A. Fearey, who were part of the earlier mission to Japan. My deputy, John M. Allison, is remaining in Washington to carry on the current discussions with representatives of Allied Powers.

We expect to return from our present mission to Tokyo in about 10 days.

Statement by Under Secretary Webb

[Released to the press April 13]

The President has asked me to wish Mr. Dulles a safe and successful trip and to reaffirm the determination of the United States to work earnestly for a prompt conclusion of a Japanese peace settlement. This policy is strongly supported on a bipartisan basis—a fact which Mr. Dulles is eminently qualified to take to the Japanese people.

Purpose of the Ambassador's Trip

[Released to the press by the White House April 11]

In view of the importance of concluding a Japanese peace settlement, as recognized by the leaders of both political parties, at the request of the President, John Foster Dulles, who is acting as the special representative of the President in this matter, will return to Tokyo over the coming week end for the dual purpose of consulting with General Ridgway and Japanese leaders.

The President has made clear that it is the firm policy of the United States Government to press forward to conclude a peace settlement with Japan as soon as possible. The principles underlying the treaty were set out by Mr. Dulles in his Los Angeles address of March 31, 1951.¹ They have been developed with the closest consultation with leaders of both parties in both houses of Congress and with General MacArthur and have the full approval of the President.

Ambassador Dulles' Departure

Ambassador John Foster Dulles, special representative of the President, left at 4:00 p.m. April 13 by special plane for Tokyo. As announced by the White House on April 11, the purpose of Mr. Dulles' trip is to confer with General Ridgway and Japanese leaders regarding matters connected with bringing about the early conclusion of a peace settlement with Japan.

Mrs. Dulles will also accompany him as will Mrs. Burnita O'Day, his private secretary.

¹ BULLETIN of Apr. 9, 1951, p. 576.

The Choices Confronting Us in Korea

Remarks by Dean Rusk

*Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs*¹

Today I should like to talk for a few minutes about where we come out in Korea. How does the fighting end?

Let's look first at the choices which are easy to think about. We could turn the fighting into a much bigger war by attacking those who are directly involved in the aggression in Korea. The action of Red China and the Soviet Union in Korea has been criminal and unconscionable. But we would not solve the Korean problem that way. We might be able to forget it, but only because we would have far more serious things to worry about. Our purpose must be to defend our security and liberties without a world war if we can; but defend them we must.

Perhaps you are one of those who say, "We don't want a general war; we only want to bomb Manchuria and attack China." But there are others in this struggle, who have great power available to them not yet committed to the aggression in Korea. They, too, can make decisions. It may be that your guess is that the Communists won't wage a general war at this time. Your guess might be right. But it might be wrong. Those who make the decision to extend hostilities beyond Korea would be completely irresponsible if they did not take into full account the element of general war, with all the destruction and loss of life which would be involved.

A second easy thing to think about is an immediate withdrawal from Korea. That, too, would lead to disaster. Korea is not the only object of the appetites and ambitions of Communist conspiracy. We could not solve anything by abandoning Korea. Who would be the next victim? And the next? And the next? Have we so soon forgotten Adolph Hitler? Each bite was to be the last. Do you remember the trail which led from Manchuria and Ethiopia to Pearl Harbor? To

abandon Korea would be to abandon the United States.

Some are now saying, "Either extend the war or get out of Korea." They are asking us to choose which of two roads to disaster we should take. Our choice must be to take neither, if we can avoid it. At this point, the job gets tough and complicated.

What we are trying to do is to maintain peace and security without a general war. We are saying to the aggressors, "You will not be allowed to get away with your crime; you must stop it." At the same time, we are trying to prevent a general conflagration which would consume the very things we are now trying to defend.

Let's admit that this effort is extremely difficult. There is no more complicated problem than to bring an end to fighting which involves the world's great powers without unconditional surrender of one side or the other—an unconditional surrender which will not come except in general war. It is hard to understand and hard to explain. It means a condition of half-war, half-peace.

Peace will come in Korea when the aggressors decide to give up their purpose. There is no present sign that they intend to do so. But if we count their casualties and the forces they now have in Korea, the aggressors have committed at least 1,250,000 troops to their criminal effort and are right where they were when the first attack was launched. In Red China itself, people are increasingly worried about sending waves of Chinese manpower into the fiery furnace of modern fire power in a foreign land, in a war hatched up by someone else.

The President reminded us last Wednesday evening that Communist aggression was repelled in Greece and in Berlin without a general war. This came about because situations were created by vigorous action on the part of the free world which made it necessary for the aggressors, for

¹ Made over NBC television on Apr. 15 and released to the press on the same date.

reasons fully known only to them, to change their course of action. Both in Greece and in Berlin, the result fully protected the essential interests of the free world and the failure of purpose and loss of prestige went to those who had flagrantly challenged the peace of the world.

Apart from Korea itself, the free peoples of the world are increasing their strength rapidly; their armed forces and their industrial production are being readied to defend themselves against the threat which has been raised against them. This very fact produces peril. For a course of events has been set in motion by the free world which will shortly place us in position to be secure and to get on with the great peaceful purposes which are our true aims. This prospect may be intolerable to the Kremlin—hence, the danger. But, we must pass through this valley of danger if we are to maintain our liberties.

No one can surely promise that we can avoid general war, because conspirators elsewhere can produce one. But, if one should come, it is important that we be in the strongest possible position to meet it. At the moment of greatest danger, strength will come from clear conscience—from the knowledge that we have done everything humanly possible to prevent it. Strength will

come from the solid alliance of all free men; welded together by their common understanding of the stakes and of the nature of the attack. Strength will come from our industrial strength as it is geared to support our armed power. Strength will come from within the iron curtain itself as men revolt against the tyranny and the aggression. All these we must not confuse by ill-considered action on our own part now.

In closing, I should like to add a word about the quality of our world leadership in the period ahead. We Americans know that our politics get boisterous at times. It is normal to our traditions and our history. But, we have vital responsibilities of world leadership; we live in a great goldfish bowl where all the world may see us. What we do here at home has endless effects abroad. It may well be that the most important single fact of the twentieth century is that the energy, wealth, power, and imagination of the American people are devoted to the peace, liberty, and economic well-being of ourselves and others. We do not serve our cause if, in this great democracy, we destroy our unity and undermine our strength, or if we lack the patience and the maturity we shall need, as we move to meet the tests ahead.

Casualties of U.N. Forces in Korea

[Released to the press by the U.N. Department of Public Information March 31]

The following are the most recent figures showing casualties suffered by the forces operating under the United Nations Command in Korea. These figures are based on an informal survey conducted by the United Nations Secretariat among delegations to the United Nations repre-

senting Governments which have contributed forces to support the United Nations action in Korea.

Except where otherwise indicated the figures given below are as of March 9.

Country	Killed in Action	Wounded in Action	Missing in Action	Total
Republic of Korea.....	16, 182	88, 511	63, 959	168, 652
United States as of 23 March.....	8, 511	37, 918	10, 691	57, 120
Turkey as of 1 March.....	298	672	199	1, 169
United Kingdom as of 21 February.....	145	442	1 305	892
France.....	84	309	3	396
Australia.....	62	196	7	265
Philippines as of 2 March.....	6	49	None	55
Netherlands.....	28	82	2	112
Greece as of 15 March.....	28	60	1	89
Canada as of 12 March.....	17	51	None	68
New Zealand.....	4	2 5	None	9
South Africa.....	0	0	3 6	6
Belgium and Luxembourg.....	(These troops were not in action before 9 March)			
Thailand as of 7 February.....	9	2 99	None	108
Total.....	25, 374	128, 394	75, 173	228, 941

¹ Including 61 prisoners.

² Including sick and injured.

³ Presumed dead.

Assisting Iran To Unite With the Free World¹

*Remarks by George C. McGhee
Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern,
South Asian and African Affairs*

MR. MCGHEE: Mr. Cronkite, I am not going to try to minimize the dangers inherent in such a strategically located and oil-rich country as Iran. Martial law, which at first was enforced only in Tehran, is now in effect in the oil fields in the southwestern part of the country. The Iranian legislature has voted for nationalization of the country's great oil industry. About 12,000 workers in the oil fields are on strike. The local Communist Party is fanning the flames of dissension.

Yet, if we take a balanced, long-range look at the situation, there is no reason to be pessimistic. To date, there is no indication that the Kremlin engineered the present crisis in Iran, much as they are delighted with it. The Shah and Prime Minister Hussein Ala, both of whom I saw during my recent visit in Iran, have shown cool judgment in meeting emergency situations. The Iranian army is behind them. This army is capable of maintaining order. There has been almost no violence in the area of the strike.

I had the opportunity for a long discussion with the Shah in Tehran on the day of the second tragic assassination, that of the Minister of Education. I was tremendously impressed with his coolness and courage, his determination to take whatever steps are required to maintain Iran's integrity. He has a keen interest in the welfare of his people and his deep desire to continue the distribution of his land and to get on with the 7-year development program in which he has played such an important role. I conveyed to him the confidence which our Government has in him, and the fact that we are fully behind Iran and want to do what we can to assist Iran.

The point I want to make is that you do not succeed in any endeavor by exaggerating the difficulties that lie ahead. You capitalize on what you have and drive ahead with a will to win. If we had concentrated on dangers of past crises instead of exploiting the strong points, Greece might have fallen to the Communists. There would have

been no Berlin airlift, no intervention by the United Nations in Korea, no North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and General Eisenhower would never have undertaken his difficult assignment in Europe.

COMMENTATOR: Well, Mr. McGhee, just what is our goal in Iran? What is it that we're trying to do in that country, some 7,000 miles from our firesides here in the United States?

MCGHEE: What we are trying to do, Mr. Cronkite, as a friend of Iran and without in any way interfering in Iranian internal affairs, is to help Iran solve its problems and strengthen its economy and its military forces. The first Point 4 Program in the world was established in Iran. We hope this program can be continued next year and increased. In 1948, we extended a 26 million dollar loan to Iran to buy military equipment. Substantial quantities of military supplies are now being shipped to Iran on a grant basis under the Mutual Defense Assistance Program. Next year, we expect this assistance to be increased. Iran has been offered a 25 million dollar Export-Import Bank Loan which will take effect as soon as the Iranian Government concludes the agreement. We are prepared to consider other needs as they arise.

COMMENTATOR: Have we done enough, Mr. McGhee?

MCGHEE: We are doing what we can. In the present world crisis with such great demands being made on us all over the world, we must distribute our aid as the needs arise and on the basis of the urgency of each situation involved. We must seek to provide what the Secretary recently called the "missing component" where other components already exist. Some people have asked why has the United States given Iran no more dollar assistance. The answer is that, until recently, Iran's problem did not appear to be a deficiency of dollars.

COMMENTATOR: I can see that we have to ration our help, Mr. McGhee. But when an economic situation does develop which justifies our help, can we move fast enough to meet it effectively?

MCGHEE: We certainly can. We did this in Greece. We did it in Turkey. We are very hopeful that Congress will give us the support to meet the famine situation in India. Here is an example

¹ A CBS television program broadcast on Apr. 8 and released to the press on the same date.

of how we can help the Iranians with our technical assistance if we move quickly. Almost the entire area of Iran, south of the 30th parallel, is in danger of being ravaged by one of the great plagues of locusts which have periodically infested these ancient lands since Biblical times. According to the latest reports, the egg fields of these locusts already cover an area of 2,000 square miles. Unless the locusts are killed off now, they will destroy the crops in southern Iran. Even more serious, the locusts will sweep northward over the entire country, eventually ravaging the northern provinces, which are the real breadbaskets of Iran. The Premier of Iran has appealed to the United States, Great Britain, and the United Nations for help. To be effective, spraying of the infested area must begin in the next 3 weeks. Within a matter of days, we have formulated an effective program for American assistance in the problem, and, by the end of this week, technicians, material, and equipment will be flown to Iran and put in operation.

COMMENTATOR: What do you think the future holds for Iran?

MC GHEE: I am optimistic for the reasons that I have mentioned, and, especially, because of the Iranian people themselves. Iran, as you know, is the modern name for Persia. The Persians built up one of the greatest empires the world has ever known centuries before the new world was discovered. Only about three million of the 16½ million people of Iran live in cities. The rest are hardy farmers or migratory tribesmen of great physical strength and intelligence. They have been fighting the Russians off and on for several hundred years. They have been conquered, but they have never been subjugated. They understand the Russians better than we do. United under their Shah, they are determined to preserve their independence. I feel confident that they will do so.

Remarks by Elbert G. Mathews

COMMENTATOR: Thank you, Mr. McGhee. And now to tell us about some of the political facts we face in the area south of the Communist empire, here is Bert Mathews, Director of the State Department's Office of South Asian Affairs.

MATHEWS: Let's amend that "some" to "a very few" of the political facts we face in the vast area from Greece to India. The countries of this area are separated by important differences of language, religion, culture, and living standards. Most of them do, however, have two things in common. First, having achieved independence after many years as colonies under one foreign empire or another, they are determined to preserve their new sovereignty and freedom at all costs. Second, they are determined to speed the development of their natural resources and the improvement of the living standards of their people.

Both of these characteristics are present in a

very high degree in India, the largest and most heavily populated country in this area. They underlie India's political outlook, which has puzzled many Americans in recent months. Yet Americans, more than any other people, should be able to understand the problems and hopes of new countries.

We should, for example, understand that India will seize every opportunity to demonstrate and defend its newly won independence of judgment and action. The Indian people will be quick to resent any evidence of an attitude of superiority or casualness on the part of other nations.

When George Washington was President, he expressed the sentiments of the new United States in advising against becoming embroiled in the world's troubles outside our own borders. Today, Prime Minister Nehru voices the hopes of his people when he says that India does not wish to become involved in the strains and tensions of the present world. The difference between India's position today and ours at the end of the eighteenth century is that the airplane, fast ships, and quick communications have left the globe much smaller, and no nation, however much it may wish to do so, can now divorce itself from the world's troubles.

We were fortunate when we proclaimed our independence in that we inherited a land rich in untapped natural resources. But the Indians are crowded into an old country which is striving to produce enough food for more than 350,000,000 people. Last year, natural disasters—droughts, floods, earthquakes, and plagues of locust—fell on the people and the land with unusual severity. Famine is imminent in the provinces of Madras, Bihar, and Assam. To avert starvation, India must import 6 million tons of grain. India is paying for 4 million tons. It is asking the United States to assist by providing the remaining 2 million tons. India could pay for this 2 million tons only by harmfully delaying the economic development programs which are essential for the country's security. If we do not give the grain, or if we send it with strings attached, we will strike a serious blow at a new growth of democracy which is taking root in Asia.

COMMENTATOR: Thank you, Mr. Mathews. It seems to me that the American people would be more willing to send grain to India if India, in return, would support our stand in the United Nations against Communist aggression in Korea. Would you care to comment on this?

MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Cronkite. I have lived closely with this problem. It is part of my job to try to understand why India takes a different position on the Far Eastern problem than we do.

The basic reason is our different estimates of the two strong forces in Asia today. Prime forces are nationalism and communism. Prime Minister Nehru of India and his Government believe that nationalism—the drive of the Asian people for

complete independence—is so strong that it can and will defeat communism. We agree that nationalism is a tremendous force. We doubt that nationalism can withstand aggressive international communism, aided and directed by power grasping regimes in Moscow and Peiping, unless all free nations, including the newly independent nations of Asia, stand together against the threat.

Let me make one last thing clear. The Indian Government has taken severe and effective measures against Communists within its borders. And India will fight if invaded. You can be sure of that.

Remarks by John Loftus

COMMENTATOR: Of all the economic problems of the Middle East and South Asian area, none is more important than oil. To answer our questions about the vital oil fields of the Middle East, here is John Loftus, economic adviser to Mr. McGhee.

Mr. Loftus, most Americans think we have all the oil we need. Is this true?

LOFTUS: In normal times we can almost make out with what we have. But, the last war was a drain on our oil resources. We have changed from a large exporter of oil to an even larger importer of oil. Western Europe, for all practical purposes, has no oil supply of its own. Before the war, Europe imported oil, mostly from the United States and Venezuela. Now, Western Europe depends on the oil fields of the Middle East for three-fourths of its needs.

Production-wise, Middle East oil did not count for much until after the last war. In 1939, the oil fields of the Middle East were producing only one-tenth of the volume which was then being produced in the United States. However, in about 10 years, production in the Middle East has risen from about 300,000 to nearly 2,000,000 barrels per day. Nearly 80 percent of the oil needed to turn the wheels of Europe's industries come from the Middle East.

The most important oil fields are in Saudi Arabia, Southern Iran, the Sheikdom of Kuwait, Bahrein Island, and the Kirkuk area in Iraq. None of the oil goes to Russia. Russia and her satellites produce only about one-half as much oil as is produced in the Middle East. All of the concessions in these Middle Eastern fields are controlled by the free nations of the world.

COMMENTATOR: I think this problem of concessions confuses some of us, Mr. Loftus. We read about the activities of American oil companies in Saudi Arabia, and British oil companies in Iran, and French oil companies in Iraq. Why can't these countries develop their own oil fields?

LOFTUS: Well, it's like this. On the one hand, a large part of the oil resources of the world is located in areas where there has not been much economic and technical progress. On the other

hand, finding, producing, transporting, and refining oil is a very complicated technical business. It requires a great deal of know-how and capital. Generally speaking, the Middle Eastern countries do not have that know-how and capital. So, in effect, they sign contracts with outside companies to do the job for them. The Government of the country which has the oil and the oil company which has the know-how and equipment to develop it sign a concession contract. The company agrees to pay the Government so much royalty on every barrel of oil produced. The Government agrees that the company shall have the right to sell the oil in world markets. The Government, in return, receives a large annual payment as its share of the proceeds. Of course, the contracts cover many other points in great detail, such as taxes, dead rents, and so on.

COMMENTATOR: But, if all details are covered in the concession contracts, why does so much tension develop between the Governments and the oil companies?

LOFTUS: Tension does not always develop, Mr. Cronkite. For example, relations between the Arabian American Oil Company and the Government of Arabia have been quite satisfactory. In Iran, obviously, the tension is very great right now.

There are many reasons for the tensions which do develop. First, the concession contracts are drawn up at a time when no one knows for sure that there is oil in the country. Almost any contract looks good to the Government at the start. But, if the fields turn out to be productive, the picture changes. The company begins to produce and sell great quantities of oil and apparently is making a lot of money. On the other hand, the oil company assumed heavy risks and invested a great deal of money. But the Governments start asking themselves why they shouldn't get a larger share of the benefits.

Second, the Government may feel that the company is not producing as much oil as it could produce. And each country would like to have its own refinery, like the one in Abadan, in Iran, largest in the world.

And so oil, which is initially an economic problem, becomes involved in the great surge of nationalism which is sweeping through the Middle East. There is no easy solution to this problem. We need the oil. These countries need the revenues from oil to finance their economic development programs and they need the companies if they are to realize these revenues. To achieve an equitable solution, Governments and oil companies alike must display statesmanship of the highest order.

Remarks by Norman Burns

COMMENTATOR: Thank you, Mr. Loftus. Oil lies under only a small fraction of the great area of the Middle East and South Asia. And now to tell

us something more about the land of this vast area, here is Norman Burns, agricultural and economic specialist on Mr. McGhee's staff.

BURNS: As Mr. Loftus pointed out, many of the world's richest oil fields have been found in the so-called underdeveloped areas where, today, there is great poverty and privation. These areas were not always underdeveloped. Several months ago, I visited the cradle of our Western civilization—the ancient valley of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers in Iraq, formerly Mesopotamia. Today, much of this valley is a desert—flat, sandy, parched by relentless sun. Yet, in the days of Nebuchadnezzar almost 3 thousand years ago, this same area, known as the Garden of Eden, supported millions of people.

With patience, hard work, and modern scientific methods, this land can again support a prosperous and progressive civilization.

Under the present system in the Middle East, most of the land is owned by a small minority and the mass of people are tenant serfs. They have no interest in improving land which is not their own. In Lebanon, two-tenths of 1 percent of the land-owners own half of the cultivable land. In Egypt, 3 million of the 4 million families living on the land own less than 1 acre, or else do not own any land at all.

Recently, the Shah of Iran made the farsighted decision to divide part of his immense land holdings among his people.

And now, let's see what the Government of Iraq did with 163,000 acres of state-owned land which the Iraq Government irrigated with a 30-mile canal between the Tigris and Euphrates. It divided the land, known as the Dujaila project, into tracts of 62½ acres each. It chose 1200 peasant families from the estates of neighboring sheikhs and leased a tract to each family. The head of the family signed a contract with the Government (putting his fingerprint on the paper, since he could neither read nor write). The tenant agreed to cultivate the land for 10 years. He agreed to build a home, a stable for his animals, and storage bins for his crops. Schools, clinics, agricultural machine shops, experimental gardens, and a nursery are within walking distance of his home. After 10 years, if he has tilled the land successfully, the tenant is given title to his tract. His future is then in his own hands. Communism holds little or no appeal for him.

Revitalizing these lands of the Middle East and South Asia is a challenge to fire the imagination of American scientists and the people of the countries themselves. On a recent trip to the Near East, I saw efforts being made to graft an olive tree to an ash tree, so that it could grow in marshy lands. In Lebanon, I saw fields of elephant grass imported from Brazil to provide cheap forage for

cattle. I saw a new variety of grass, known as kudzu, which stores nitrogen in the soil. In Syria, I saw evergreen trees being tested for reforestation. I saw irrigation projects, macadamized roads, experimental farms, a new port at Latakia. In Transjordan, I saw sheep drinking from an ancient Roman cistern which engineers plan to clean out and rebuild as part of a modern water supply.

Americans are eager to offer their technical assistance for these development projects. However, the initiative and the elbow grease to get these projects started must come from the people who will use and benefit from them. The initiative is there. But, in many countries, it is held back by suspicions of our motives, by local red tape and by inertia. The lowest classes of people live in such poverty that, for them, almost any change would be an improvement of their present situation.

Above all, there is the element of time. We must speed up the process of helping these people to improve their lot. If we fail in this effort, many of them will turn in despair to communism.

Summary by Assistant Secretary McGhee

COMMENTATOR: Thank you, Mr. Burns. And now to summarize the facts we face in this vital area south of the Communist empire, here, again, is Assistant Secretary of State McGhee.

MCGHEE: There is not the least doubt in my mind that the strategists in the Kremlin are seeking to gain control of this area as quickly as they can. In their hands, these lands would provide them with great manpower resources, with the oil, manganese, and the many other strategic materials which they need to fight a global war.

In my judgment, they cannot succeed for the following reasons. Without exception, the vast majority of the people in the Near East and South Asia abhor the Communist doctrine. They are religious, they are individualistic, they have old and honored cultures which they are determined to preserve. Most of them are new nations. They have won their independence after centuries of struggle under colonial yoke.

They will not surrender it easily now. They are suspicious of influences from the West, but they are more suspicious of the new Communist imperialism. They are determined to succeed in the hard task of raising their standards of living so that they may share the advantages of free government.

Many of these nations have shown their determination to resist Communist aggression by their stand in the United Nations with respect to Korea. Some have sent troops to fight for the cause of the United Nations in Korea. We, in turn, must continue to take all practical steps to help them realize their aspirations so that they can unite with the rest of the free world for mutual security.

U.S. Aid to Iran in Fight Against Locust Plague

[Released to the press April 10]

Two DC-4 Skymaster planes, carrying six disassembled single-engine planes and over six tons of insecticide to fight the locust plague in Iran, are scheduled to leave Idlewild International Airport, New York, within the next 24 hours. A third plane, carrying two more small planes and additional supplies, is scheduled to take off for Tehran, April 13.

This emergency action, taken at the request of the Iranian Government, is being carried out as part of the Point 4 Program of technical cooperation, administered by the Department of State. A Point 4 project is already in operation in Iran for the purpose of increasing food production and improving living conditions in rural areas.

The flights and spraying operations are being carried out under contract by the United States Overseas Airlines, a private charter service. The Iranian Government will provide fuel for the spraying planes and will house and feed the pilots and mechanics who are making the trip. About 20 of the group will remain in Iran to spray the fields.

A Department of Agriculture entomologist, William R. Mabey, will fly to Iran to direct the technical phases of the project and will remain in Iran as one of the group of American technicians engaged in the long-range technical cooperation project. Mr. Mabey has been stationed at Elko, Nevada, as a supervisor of grasshopper control in the Western States. He is one of the pioneers in the use of airplanes for applying insecticides to field crops to control insects. Another Department of Agriculture entomologist, Edson J. Hambleton, also will make the trip to Iran, but he will stay there only a short time.

Reports from Iran indicate that over 130,000 square miles of cultivated land are threatened by the plague of locusts. At present, the egg fields of the insects actually cover about 2,000 square miles in southern Iran below the 30th parallel, an area where wheat, barley, pistachio nuts, almonds, and other foods are grown. However, Iranian authorities advise that unless the insects are killed off within the next 3 weeks, the locusts will swarm northward, eventually reaching the northern provinces of Iran which are the real breadbaskets of the country.

After the transport planes arrive in Iran, only 6 hours will be needed to assemble the spraying planes. They will carry a new insecticide—aldrin, 2 ounces of which, mixed in solvent, are enough to kill locusts covering an acre of ground. The material to be used in Iran was flown from Denver to Idlewild yesterday.

Preparations for the emergency action have been completed in record time by State Department and

aviation officials. Passports, visas, and inoculations for personnel making the trip have been obtained on 24-hour notice.

The small planes will be ready to begin spraying operations within 10 days after the Iranian officials made their appeal to the United States Government.

Joint Communiqué on U.S.-U.K. Iranian Talks

[Released to the press April 9]

The opening exchange of views between the British Ambassador and the State Department has taken place in a cordial atmosphere. These talks were informal and exploratory and dealt in a positive and constructive way with matters of mutual interest between the British and United States Governments relating to Iran.

The British and United States Governments have many times demonstrated their concern with the stability of Iran and the well-being of the Iranian people. Both Governments, for instance, in May 1950, declared their interest in the continued political independence and territorial integrity of Iran, and they have both given proof of their willingness to provide Iran with technical and material assistance. It is the earnest hope of the British and United States Governments that this mutual cooperation will be maintained and developed with advantage to the peoples of all three countries.

Iranian oil has played a vital part in world trade and in meeting the requirements of many countries of the free world. Its importance to Iran, to the United Kingdom, and to the economy of the free world generally is, of course, great. Hence, the two Governments, while recognizing that questions relating to Iranian oil must be settled elsewhere, have deemed it advisable to exchange views informally.

Further exchanges of views will take place.

Admiral Robert B. Carney To Visit Jordan

[Released to the press April 10]

On the invitation of the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan, Admiral Robert B. Carney, USN, Commander in Chief, United States Naval Forces in the Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean, is scheduled to arrive today at Amman, the capital of Jordan. Admiral Carney's visit is in connection with the celebration on April 11 of Arab Legion Day.

Trade Agreement With Costa Rica Terminated

[Released to the press April 4]

Representatives of the Government of the United States and the Government of Costa Rica exchanged notes on April 3 providing for termination of the trade agreement between the two Governments signed November 28, 1936. The trade agreement will cease to be in force on and after June 1, 1951.

In the trade agreement, Costa Rica in 1937 granted reductions and bindings on a wide range of agricultural and industrial products. The Costa Rican customs duties, which will be applied to these items after termination of the trade agreement, have not been announced. The United States bound or reduced its duties on four tropical fruit products (dried bananas, pineapples, preserved guavas, mango and guava pastes) and bound on the free list bananas and plantains, coffee, cocoa beans, deer and reptile skins, turtles, balsa, and cabinet woods. The United States tariff status of these items will be unchanged since the dutiable items are included at the same or lower levels in other trade agreements, and the free list articles are also bound free in other agreements.

In 1948, the Costa Rican Government, impelled by a large imbalance in its trade with the United States and in order to increase its revenues, took steps to restrict imports of nonessential goods and applied exchange surcharges to certain categories of imports, including some items covered by the trade agreement. New legislation in Costa Rica, effective April 1, 1950, provided for increased exchange surcharges. In order to permit Costa Rica to seek a solution of its emergency financial difficulties which would not be in conflict with the trade agreement, the United States agreed to a waiver of article I of the agreement for a year ending March 31, 1951.¹

In the meantime, during the course of conversations between representatives of the two Governments, it became evident that because of special conditions Costa Rica would be unable to apply the terms of the trade agreement in the foreseeable future. After a full exploration of various alternatives, the two Governments therefore agreed to joint termination of the trade agreement effective June 1, 1951. The waiver of article I of the agreement has been extended to that termination date.

¹ BULLETIN of May 1, 1950, p. 694.

TEXT OF COSTA RICAN NOTE

April 3, 1951

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to your Excellency's note dated April 3, 1951, relating to the termination by mutual consent of the trade agreement signed November 28, 1936, and relating to the extension of the agreement effected by exchange of notes on April 4, 1950.

I have the honor to confirm the agreement arrived at in the course of conversations between representatives of our two Governments, which agreement is set forth in your note of April 3, 1951, above mentioned.

As proposed in that note, it is agreed that your note and this reply shall constitute an agreement between our two Governments which shall enter into force today.

Accept [etc.]

J. RAFAEL OREAMUNO

TEXT OF UNITED STATES NOTE

April 3, 1951

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to conversations between representatives of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Costa Rica regarding the termination by mutual consent of the trade agreement signed November 28, 1936. I also have the honor to refer to the agreement effected by an exchange of notes on April 4, 1950 whereby the Government of the United States, at the request of the Government of Costa Rica, agreed to waive, for a period of one year, beginning April 1, 1950, the provisions of Article I of the above-mentioned trade agreement to permit the application of multiple exchange surcharges to imports from the United States of America of articles listed in Schedule I of the trade agreement.

The Government of Costa Rica has made it clear that special conditions exist, and will continue to exist for the foreseeable future, which will make it impossible for Costa Rica to apply the terms of the trade agreement. In view of these conditions, and in accordance with the conversations to which I have referred, I have the honor to confirm the agreement reached today in a friendly and understanding spirit that the Trade Agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of Costa Rica, signed at San José on November 28, 1936, shall cease to be in force on and after June 1, 1951.

Pursuant to the request of the Government of Costa Rica during the course of the above-mentioned conversations and recognizing the problems confronting the Government of Costa Rica, I further confirm that the Government of the United States of America agrees to extend from April 1, 1951 through May 31, 1951 the waiver of Article I of the trade agreement as granted

in the agreement effected by the exchange of notes dated April 4, 1950.

If the Government of Costa Rica concurs in the foregoing, this note and Your Excellency's reply thereto will constitute an agreement between our two Governments, which shall enter into force on the date of Your Excellency's note.

It is understood that the Government of Costa Rica is desirous of exploring the possibility of negotiating a comprehensive treaty of friendship, commerce and navigation between our two countries. My Government is equally desirous of undertaking discussions concerning such a treaty and is prepared to begin them at an early date.

Accept [etc.].

For the Secretary of State:
THOMAS C. MANN



Death of Ernest Bevin, Former British Foreign Minister

Statement by Secretary Acheson

[Released to the press April 14]

Ernest Bevin's death brings to me deep sorrow from the loss of a friend and trusted colleague. We have worked together for two and one half years in a critical and troubled time, sharing common problems and determined in the interests of our countries to find solutions in common. To work with him inevitably evoked deep affection, respect, and trust. It could not be otherwise, because his indomitable courage, his simplicity and directness, his love of his country and his understanding of the grandeur of its contribution to the cause of human liberty, his humanity and knowledge of the struggles and aspirations of his fellowmen, his own warm affectionate good humor made him both loved and trusted.

We have sat together in many international conferences and personal meetings. We have exchanged innumerable messages on the problems confronting us. He fought hard for views which were always founded on a remarkable knowledge of history, an apprehension—deeper than knowledge—that he was acting in the moving stream of history, and an understanding of present facts. But his mind was not closed. It was tough, and often stubborn, but always open to arguments strongly and honestly pushed.

Not only his own countrymen but all of us to whom freedom and liberty are the foundation of our lives will stand in spirit beside his grave in sorrow and gratitude and joy that in these times such a man has lived.

Ernest Bevin was a gallant gentleman, a great Englishman, a fighter for the freedom of all men.



Legislation—Continued from page 645

Clarifying the Immigration Status of Certain Aliens. S. Rept. 111, 82d Cong. 1st sess. [To accompany S. 728] 4 pp.

Authorizing Vessels of Canadian Registry To Transport Iron Ore Between United States Ports on the Great Lakes During 1951. S. Rept. 119, 82d Cong. 1st sess. [To accompany S. 683] 4 pp.

Assignment of Ground Forces of the United States to Duty in the European Area. Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services on S. Res. 99 and S. Con. Res. 18. S. Rept. 175, 82d Cong. 1st sess. iii, Map, 23 pp.

Ninth Semiannual Report of the Atomic Energy Commission. S. Doc. 6, 82d Cong. 1st sess. vii, 158 pp.

Basic Data Relating to Energy Resources. Study Made by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, pursuant to S. Res. 239 (81st Cong.) to investigate available fuel reserves and formulate a national fuel policy of the United States. S. Doc. 8, 82d Cong. 1st sess. xxi, 226 pp.

Investigation of the Preparedness Program. Fifth Report of the preparedness subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate, under the authority of S. Res. 18 (82d Cong.). Interim Report on Lackland Air Force Base. S. Doc. 9, 82d Cong. 1st sess. v, 22 pp. Also, Sixth Report . . . Tin, 1951. S. Doc. 13, 82d Cong. 1st sess. vii, 56 pp.

North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement and Final Protocol Thereto. Message from the President of the United States transmitting the North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement and the final protocol thereto, which were signed in the English, Spanish, and French languages at Washington on November 15, 1950, by the respective plenipotentiaries of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for the territories in the North American Region (Bahamas and Jamaica), Canada, Cuba, and the Dominican Republic. Senate Ex. A, 82d Cong. 1st sess. 100 pp.

1951 Extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Hearing before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Eighty-second Congress, first session, on H. R. 1612, a bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes. January 22, 24, 25, and 26, 1951. [Department of State, pp. 1-104.] vi, 625 pp.

India Emergency Assistance Act of 1951. Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Eighty-second Congress, first session, on H. R. 2692, H. R. 2693, H. R. 2694, H. R. 2695, H. R. 2696, H. R. 2698, H. R. 2699, H. R. 2700, H. R. 2702, H. R. 2705, H. R. 2706, and H. R. 3017, bills to furnish emergency food relief Assistance to India. February 20, 21, 22, 23, 1951. [Department of State, pp. 5-38, 45-103, 204-206, 217-225.] iv, 233 pp.

Imports Controls on Fats, Oils, Rice, and Rice Products. Hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Eighty-first Congress, first session, on H. R. 5240, a bill to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils, and rice and rice products. June 21, 1949. iii, 5 pp.

The Effect of Imports on Employment. Hearings before a special subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Eighty-first Congress, second session, pursuant to H. Res. 75, a resolution authorizing the committee on education and labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction. Hearings held at Washington, D. C., May 2, 6, 15, 16, June 1, 2, 12, 26, and 27, 1950. vii, 430 pp.

Compulsory Jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice

ADDITIONS UP THROUGH MARCH 31, 1951

Notes by Denys P. Myers

Compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice is a continuation of the compulsory jurisdiction established by article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice. Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, therefore, provides for declarations of states parties to the Statute to be effective either—

(a) under the present Statute in virtue of article 36, paragraph 2; or

(b) under the terms of declarations made with respect to the Permanent Court of International Justice and carried over by application of article 36, paragraph 5, of the present Statute.

Compulsory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice was effected by signing a declaration setting forth the terms and conditions reciprocally accepted by the respective party to the Statute. That Statute was brought into force by ratification of a covering protocol of signature dated December 16, 1920, to which was annexed an optional clause providing a medium by which parties to the Statute accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of article 36 in affixing to it the declaration above-mentioned. Ratification of declarations was not expressly required, but ratification was frequently a condition of a declaration.

Compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice is effected by depositing with the Secretary-General of the United Nations a declaration stating the terms and conditions of acceptance. Since the Statute of the International Court of Justice is an annex and an integral part of the Charter of the United Nations, no special protocol of the type of the former optional

clause was set up. Declarations of acceptance may be made subject to ratification. Declarations made under the Statute of the International Court of Justice are separately registered in accordance with article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations and published in the United Nations Treaty Series. They are communicated to the registrar of the International Court of Justice and published in chapter X of the *Yearbook* issued by him for successive years beginning July 15, 1946.

The pertinent provisions of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, in force since October 24, 1945, are:

Article 36

1. The jurisdiction of the Court comprises all cases which the parties refer to it and all matters specially provided for in the Charter of the United Nations or in treaties and conventions in force.

2. The states parties to the present Statute may at any time declare that they recognize as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes concerning:

- (a) the interpretation of a treaty;
- (b) any question of international law;
- (c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
- (d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

3. The declarations referred to above may be made unconditionally or on condition of reciprocity on the part of several or certain states, or for a certain time.

4. Such declarations shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall transmit copies thereof to the parties to the Statute and to the Registrar of the Court.

5. Declarations made under Article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and which

are still in force shall be deemed, as between the parties to the present Statute, to be acceptances of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice for the period which they still have to run and in accordance with their terms.

6. In the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court.

Declarations were first compiled and published in the June 1948 issue of *Documents and State Papers* and reprinted with revisions as Department of State publication 3540, International Organization and Conference Series, III, 31, under the title of *Compulsory Jurisdiction of the Inter-*

Status of Declarations Accepting Compulsory Jurisdiction

(Asterisks (*) indicate declarations made before October 24, 1945, which continue in force.)

State	Date of signature	Currently effective from	Duration	References UN Treaty Series Yearbook
*Australia	Aug. 21, 1940 .	Sept. 2, 1940 .	5 years, and until notice to terminate. '46:216
Belgium	June 10, 1948 .	July 13, 1948 .	5 years	16:203; no. 260 '47:130
Bolivia	July 5, 1948 .	July 5, 1948 .	5 years	16:207; no. 261 '47:131
Brazil	Feb. 12, 1948 .	Mar. 12, 1948 .	5 years	15:221; no. 237 '47:130
*Canada	Sept. 20, 1929 .	July 28, 1930 .	10 years, and until notice to terminate. '46:208
China	Oct. 26, 1946 .	Oct. 26, 1946 .	5 years, then 6 months' notice.	1:35; no. 5 . . '46:218
*Colombia	Oct. 30, 1937 .	Oct. 30, 1937 .	Indefinite '46:212
Denmark	Dec. 10, 1946 .	Dec. 11, 1946 .	10 years	1:45; no. 10 . . '46:219
*Dominican Republic	Sept. 30, 1924 .	Feb. 4, 1933 .	Indefinite '46:208
*El Salvador	Before Jan. 28, 1921.	Aug. 19, 1930 .	Indefinite '46:210
France	Feb. 18, 1947 .	Mar. 1, 1949 .	5 years, and until notice to terminate.	26:91; no. 378 '46:220
Guatemala	Jan. 27, 1947 .	Jan. 27, 1947 .	5 years	1:49; no. 12 . . '46:219
*Haiti	[1921]	Sept. 7, 1921 .	Indefinite '46:207
Honduras	Feb. 2, 1948 .	Feb. 10, 1948 .	6 years	15:217; no. 236 '47:129
*India	Feb. 28, 1940 .	Mar. 7, 1940 .	5 years, and until notice to terminate. '46:213
*Iran	Oct. 2, 1930 .	Sept. 19, 1932 .	6 years, and until notice of abrogation. '46:211
Israel	Sept. 4, 1950	5 years, from ratification
Liechtenstein	Mar. 10, 1950 .	Mar. 29, 1950 .	Until revocation on 1 year's notice.	no. 759 '49:165
*Luxembourg	Sept. 15, 1930 .	Sept. 15, 1930 .	Renewable for 5-year periods. '46:210
Mexico	Oct. 23, 1947 .	Mar. 1, 1947 .	5 years, then 6 months' notice.	9:97; no. 127 '47:129
Netherlands	Aug. 5, 1946 .	Aug. 6, 1946 .	10 years, and until notice of abrogation.	1:7; no. 2 . . . '46:217
*New Zealand	Apr. 1, 1940 .	Apr. 8, 1940 .	5 years, and until notice to terminate. '46:214
*Nicaragua	Sept. 24, 1929 .	Nov. 29, 1939 .	Indefinite '46:210
Norway	Nov. 16, 1946 .	Oct. 3, 1946 .	10 years	1:37; no. 6 . . . '46:219
Pakistan	June 22, 1948 .	July 9, 1948 .	5 years, and until notice to terminate.	16:197; no. 259 '47:131
*Panama	Oct. 25, 1921 .	June 14, 1929 .	Indefinite '46:207
*Paraguay	May 11, 1933 .	May 11, 1933 .	Indefinite '46:211
Philippines	July 12, 1947 .	July 4, 1946 .	For 10 years, from July 4, 1946, and until notice of abrogation.	7:229; no. 101 '47:128
Sweden	Apr. 5, 1947 .	Apr. 6, 1947 .	10 years	2:3; no. 16 . . . '46:220
Switzerland	July 6, 1948 .	July 28, 1948 .	Indefinite	17:115; no. 272 '47:132
*Thailand	Sept. 20, 1929 .	May 7, 1930 .	10-year period '46:208
	May 3, 1940 .	May 7, 1940 .	10-year period '46:208
	May 20, 1950 .	May 3, 1950 .	10-year period	no. 844
Turkey	May 22, 1947 .	June 6, 1947 .	5 years	4:265; no. 50 '47:127
*Union of South Africa.	Apr. 7, 1940 .	Apr. 20, 1940 .	Indefinite '46:215
*United Kingdom . .	Feb. 28, 1940 .	Mar. 7, 1940 .	5 years, and until notice to terminate. '46:212
British Honduras . .	Feb. 13, 1946 .	Feb. 13, 1946 .	5 years	1:3; no. 1 . . . '46:217
	Feb. 12, 1951 .	Feb. 12, 1951 .	5 years	annex no. 1 . . .
United States	Aug. 14, 1946 .	Aug. 14, 1946 .	5 years, then 6 months' notice.	1:9; no. 3 . . . '46:217
*Uruguay	Before Jan. 28, 1921.	Sept. 27, 1921 .	Indefinite '46:207

national Court of Justice. The table here presented shows the status of declarations currently in force or made.

All declarations are by the Statute reciprocal "in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation" and are also made "on condition of reciprocity" with regard to terms expressed in them.

Declarations made or renewed since June 1949, when publication 3540 was issued, follow:

Israel

[Translated from French by the Government of Israel]

On behalf of the Government of Israel, and subject to ratification, I declare that Israel recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to all other Members of the United Nations and to any non-member State which becomes a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice pursuant to Article 93, paragraph 2 of the Charter and which accepts the same obligation (that is, subject to reciprocity) the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the said Court in all legal disputes concerning situations or facts which may arise after the date of deposit of the instrument of ratification of this declaration¹ and, in particular, which do not involve a legal title created or conferred by a Government or authority other than the Government of the State of Israel or an authority under the jurisdiction of that Government.

This declaration does not apply:

(a) to any dispute in respect of which the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another means of peaceful settlement;

(b) to any dispute relating to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the State of Israel;²

(c) to any dispute between the State of Israel and another State which refuses to establish or maintain normal relations with it.

The present declaration has been made for five years as from the date of deposit of the instrument of ratification.³

Hakirya, the twenty-second of Elul five thousand seven hundred and ten.

(the fourth of September 1950)⁴

M. SHARETT

Minister of Foreign Affairs

CERTIFIED TRUE COPY

Assistant Secretary-General
Legal Department

Liechtenstein⁴

The Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein, duly authorized by His Serene Highness, the Reigning

¹ Ratification by the Cabinet under Israeli law had not been given by Mar. 31, 1951.

² An official press release of Nov. 29, 1950 pointed out that this condition would apply specifically to all matters arising out of the Mandate for Palestine of July 24, 1922, or which took place during the time the mandate was in force, i.e., until Aug. 1, 1948 (stipulated by the Plan of Partition with Economic Union approved by res. 181 (III) of the General Assembly of the United Nations, Nov. 29, 1947).

³ Deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations Oct. 11, 1950.

⁴ Translated from the French; registration no. 759.

Prince François Joseph II, in accordance with the Order of the Diet of the Principality of Liechtenstein dated 9 March 1950, which came into force on 10 March 1950,

declares by these presents that the Principality of Liechtenstein recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes concerning:

(a) the interpretation of a treaty;

(b) any question of international law;

(c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

(d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

The present Declaration, which is made under Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, shall take effect from the date⁵ on which the Principality becomes a party to the Statute and shall have effect as long as the Declaration has not been revoked subject to one year's notice.

DONE at Vaduz, 10 March 1950

On behalf of the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein

Head of Government

[SEAL]

A. FRICK

Thailand (Siam)⁶

On behalf of the Siamese Government, I recognize, subject to ratification, in relation to any other Member or State which accepts the same obligation, that is to say, on the condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory *ipso facto* and without any special convention, in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court for a period of ten years in all disputes, as to which no other means of pacific settlement is agreed upon between the parties.

GENEVA, September 20, 1929.⁷

VARNAVIDYA

RENEWAL

On behalf of the Thai Government, I hereby renew for a period of 10 years, from May 7th, 1940, the declaration of September 20th, 1929, accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court within the limits of and subject to the conditions and reservations set forth in the said declaration.

BANGKOK, May 3rd, 1940.

PIBULABONGGRAN.

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
BANGKOK, [May 20, 1950].⁸

RENEWAL

No. 9083/2493

SIR, I have the honour to inform you that by a declaration dated September 20, 1920 [i. e., 1929] His Majesty's

⁵ The declaration in virtue of which Liechtenstein became a party to Statute was deposited with the Secretariat and effective on Mar. 29, 1950; registration no. 758.

⁶ The name of Kingdom of Siam was changed to Thailand on June 24, 1939; back to Siam on Sept. 7, 1945; and to Thailand again on May 11, 1949 (BULLETIN of June 12, 1949, p. 765).

⁷ Ratification deposited with the Secretariat of the League of Nations, May 7, 1930.

⁸ Deposited and registered in the Secretariat, June 13, 1950; registration no. 844.

Government had accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute for a period of ten years and on condition of reciprocity. That declaration has been renewed on May 3, 1940 for another period of ten years.

In accordance with the provisions of Article 36, paragraph 4 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, I have now the honour to inform you that His Majesty's Government hereby renew the declaration above mentioned for a further period of ten years as from May 3, 1950 with the limits and subject to the same conditions and reservations as set forth in the first declaration of September 20, 1920 [i. e., 1929].

I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

(signed) Illegible
[WORAKAN BANCHAI]

Minister of Foreign Affairs of Thailand

The Secretary-General of the United Nations,
Lake Success, New York.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

On behalf of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, I now declare that they accept as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special convention, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, for a period of five years from today's date and thereafter until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after February 5th, 1930, with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the same date, other than:

disputes in regard to which the Parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

disputes with the government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the Parties have agreed or shall agree;

disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the United Kingdom; and

disputes arising out of events occurring at a time when His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom were involved in hostilities;

and subject to the condition that His Majesty's Government reserve the right to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the proceedings in the Court, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the Parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the Parties to the dispute.

LONDON, February 28, 1940.⁹

HALIFAX.

⁹ Received in the Secretariat of the League of Nations Mar. 7, 1940. For the circumstances under which this declaration was substituted for the previous declaration of Sept. 19, 1929, in force on Feb. 5, 1930 (as stated in this declaration), see Department of State publication 3540, p. 16.

DECLARATION] WITH RESPECT TO] ALL [LEGAL DISPUTES CONCERNING THE INTERPRETATION, APPLICATION OR VA- LIDITY OF ANY TREATY RELATING TO THE BOUNDARIES OF BRITISH HONDURAS¹⁰

I, Ernest Bevin, His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, declare on behalf of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice that for a period of five years from the date of this declaration they accept as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes concerning the interpretation, application or validity of any treaty relating to the boundaries of British Honduras, and over any questions arising out of any conclusion which the Court may reach with regard to such treaty.

Given under my hand and seal, at the Foreign Office, London, this Thirteenth day of February, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Forty-six.

ERNEST BEVIN.

DECLARATION¹¹

I, Kenneth Gilmour Younger, Minister of State, on behalf of His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, declare on behalf of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice that the Declaration of the 13th February 1946, concerning any treaty relating to the boundaries of British Honduras, is renewed for a further period of five years beginning on the 12th February 1951, the date of the expiry of the Declaration of 1946.

Given under my hand and seal at the Foreign Office, London, this twelfth day of February, One thousand, nine hundred and fifty-one.

K. G. YOUNGER

APPENDIX 1—REVISED GENERAL ACT FOR THE PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

Adopted by General Assembly of United Nations, Apr. 28, 1949¹²
In force for 5-year periods from Sept. 20, 1950¹³
[Excerpts]

¹⁰ 1 United Nations Treaty Series, p. 3; registration no. 1.

¹¹ Circular note of the Assistant Secretary-General, Legal Department, Mar. 2, 1951.

¹² Res. 268 (III) of the General Assembly, 3d sess., 2d part. The Revised General Act was registered *ex officio* Sept. 20, 1950; registration no. 912.

¹³ The instrument entered into force 90 days after deposit of the second accession. Belgium's accession, Dec. 23, 1949, extended to all provisions. Sweden's accession, June 22, 1950, extends to chaps. I (conciliation), II (judicial settlement), and IV (procedure); its accession to the General Act of Sept. 26, 1928, extended to chaps. I and IV.

The revised text of article 43 provides:

"1. The present General Act shall be open to accession by the Members of the United Nations, by the non-member States which shall have become parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice or to which the General Assembly of the United Nations shall have communicated a copy for this purpose."

The General Assembly by resolutions 372 (IV), December 3, 1949, and 480 (V), December 12, 1950, deferred until the sixth session the designation of nonmember states to which certified copies should be communicated for the purpose of accession.

Chapter II: Judicial Settlement

Article 17

All disputes with regard to which the parties are in conflict as to their respective rights shall, subject to any reservations which may be made under Article 39, be submitted for decision to the International Court of Justice, unless the parties agree, in the manner hereinafter provided, to have resort to an arbitral tribunal.

It is understood that the disputes referred to above include in particular those mentioned in Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

Chapter IV: General Provisions

Article 39

1. In addition to the power given in the preceding article,¹⁴ a Party, in acceding to the present General Act, may make his acceptance conditional upon the reservations exhaustively enumerated in the following paragraph. These reservations must be indicated at the time of accession.

2. These reservations may be such as to exclude from the procedure described in the present Act:

(a) Disputes arising out of facts prior to the accession either of the Party making the reservation or of any other Party with whom the said Party may have a dispute;

(b) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States;

(c) Disputes concerning particular cases or clearly specified subject-matters, such as territorial status, or disputes falling within clearly defined categories.

3. If one of the parties to a dispute has made a reservation, the other parties may enforce the same reservation in regard to that party.

4. In the case of Parties, who have acceded to the provisions of the present General Act relating to judicial settlement or to arbitration, such reservations as they may have made shall, unless otherwise expressly stated, be deemed not to apply to the procedure of conciliation.

NOTE

The General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes was opened for accession by the Assembly of the League of Nations September 26, 1928¹⁵ and entered into force for successive 5-year periods from August 16, 1929. The Revised General Act adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on April 28, 1949 pro-

¹⁴ Art. 38 permits accession to all or only certain chapters of the General Act, which are: I, (conciliation); II, (judicial settlement); III, (arbitration); IV, (general provisions).

¹⁵ 93 League of Nations Treaty Series, p. 343; registration no. 2123.

vides for the "restoration to the General Act of 26 September 1928 of its original efficacy" by amending the text so that assignments to the League of Nations and the Permanent Court of International Justice are replaced by references to the United Nations and the International Court of Justice. The resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations was a specific application of the principles established by resolution 24 (I) of February 12, 1946 relating to the transfer of functions and powers belonging to the League of Nations under international agreements.

The General Act of September 26, 1928 remains in force, the current 5-year period beginning August 16, 1949. An accession is subject to denunciation for the period beginning August 16, 1954 on 6-months' notice before that date. Accessions in force are as follows:

State	Date
Australia	May 21, 1931
Belgium	May 18, 1929
Canada	July 1, 1931
Denmark*	Apr. 14, 1930
Estonia	Sept. 3, 1931
Ethiopia*	Mar. 15, 1935
Finland*	Sept. 6, 1930
France	May 21, 1931
Greece	Sept. 14, 1931
India	May 21, 1931
Ireland*	Sept. 26, 1931
Italy	Sept. 7, 1931
Latvia*	Sept. 17, 1935
Luxembourg*	Sept. 15, 1930
Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam, and Curaçao)	Aug. 8, 1930
New Zealand	May 21, 1931
Norway*	June 11, 1930
Peru	Nov. 21, 1931
Sweden	May 13, 1929
Switzerland*	Dec. 7, 1934
Turkey	June 26, 1934
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	May 21, 1931

*Acceded without reservations. For the text of the reservations made by other states see United Nations, *Signatures, Ratifications, Acceptances, Accessions, etc., concerning the Multilateral Conventions and Agreements in respect of which the Secretary-General acts as Depository*, p. 25-30 (1949, V. 9).

The Netherlands and Sweden acceded only to chaps. I (conciliation), II (judicial settlement), and IV (general provisions).

APPENDIX 2—BELGIUM, FRANCE, LUXEMBOURG, NETHERLANDS, UNITED KINGDOM

The treaty of collaboration and collective self-defense signed by plenipotentiaries of Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern

Ireland at Brussels on March 17, 1948, and in force for 50 years from August 25, 1948,¹⁶ contains the following provisions:

Article VIII

In pursuance of their determination to settle disputes only by peaceful means, the High Contracting Parties will apply to disputes between themselves the following provisions:

The High Contracting Parties will, while the present Treaty remains in force, settle all disputes falling within the scope of Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice by referring them to the Court, subject only, in the case of each of them, to any reservation already made by that Party when accepting this clause for compulsory jurisdiction to the extent that that Party may maintain the reservation.

In addition, the High Contracting Parties will submit to conciliation all disputes outside the scope of Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice. In the case of a mixed dispute involving both questions for which conciliation is appropriate and other questions for which judicial settlement is appropriate, any Party to the dispute shall have the right to insist that the judicial settlement of the legal questions shall precede conciliation.

The preceding provisions of this Article in no way affect the application of relevant provisions of agreements prescribing some other method of pacific settlement.

APPENDIX 3—AMERICAN TREATY ON PACIFIC SETTLEMENT: “PACT OF BOGOTÁ”

Signed at Bogotá, April 30, 1948; in force May 6, 1949¹⁷

Chapter IV: Judicial Procedure

Article 31

In conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, the High Contracting Parties declare that they recognize, in relation to any other American State,

¹⁶ Registered with the Secretariat Nov. 2, 1948; 19 United Nations Treaty Series, p. 51; registration no. 304.

Art. IX of the treaty provides that the parties “may, by agreement, invite any other state to accede to the present treaty on conditions to be agreed to between them and the state so invited.”

¹⁷ 30 United Nations Treaty Series, p. 55; registration no. 449.

Ratifications have been deposited with the Pan American Union as follows: Costa Rica, May 6, 1949; Dominican Republic, Sept. 12, 1950; El Salvador, Sept. 11, 1950; Haiti, Mar. 28, 1951; Honduras, Feb. 7, 1950; Mexico, Nov. 23, 1948; Nicaragua, July 26, 1950.

the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory *ipso facto*, without the necessity of any special agreement so long as the present Treaty is in force, in all disputes of a juridical nature that arise among them concerning:

- a) The interpretation of a treaty;
- b) Any question of international law;
- c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute the breach of an international obligation;
- d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

Article 32

When the conciliation procedure previously established in the present Treaty or by agreement of the parties does not lead to a solution, and the said parties have not agreed upon an arbitral procedure, either of them shall be entitled to have recourse to the International Court of Justice in the manner prescribed in Article 40 of the Statute thereof. The Court shall have compulsory jurisdiction in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 1, of the said Statute.

Article 34

If the Court, for the reasons set forth in Articles 5, 6 and 7 of this Treaty [domestic jurisdiction, matters settled or governed by instruments in force April 30, 1948, exhaustion of local remedies], declares itself to be without jurisdiction to hear the controversy, such controversy shall be declared ended.

NOTE

This treaty, which comes into force for the parties “in the order in which they deposit their respective ratifications” with the Pan American Union, would make article 31 applicable between Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela, which have not separately accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. Argentina by an express reservation did not adhere to chapter IV.

The United States at signing made certain reservations. It did not “undertake as the complainant State to submit to the International Court of Justice any controversy which is not considered to be properly within the jurisdiction of the Court.” It noted that its acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction under the treaty “is limited by any jurisdictional or other limitations contained in any Declaration deposited by the United States under Article 36, paragraph 4, of the Statute of the Court, and in force at the time of the submission of any case.”

• This compilation was assembled by Denys P. Myers, specialist in international organization, Office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State.

U.S. Delegation to International Meetings

Seventh Session Human Rights

On April 5, the Department of State announced that Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, the United States representative on the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, will attend the seventh session of the Commission, which is scheduled to convene at Geneva, on April 16, 1951. The other members of the United States delegation to the seventh session of the Commission are as follows:

Advisers

Herbert Beaser, Office of the General Counsel Federal Security Agency
John M. Cates, Jr., Office of United Nations Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State
Frieda S. Miller, Director, Women's Bureau, Department of Labor
Herzel Plaine, Special Assistant to the Attorney General, Department of Justice
James Simsarian, Office of United Nations Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State
Marjorie Whiteman, Office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State

Special Assistant to United States Representative

Malvina Thompson, Assistant to Mrs. Roosevelt

The Commission on Human Rights will give priority at its seventh session to the revision of the draft International Covenant on Human Rights. In resolutions on the subject adopted at its 1950 session, the General Assembly of the United Nations requested, among other things, that: the list of rights in the first 18 articles of the Covenant be reexamined in order to insure the adequacy of that list and to define the rights and limitations with the greatest possible precision; the desirability be studied of including a special article on the application of the Covenant to federal states; provision be made for the inclusion in the Covenant of economic, social, and cultural rights, and an explicit recognition of the equality of men and women; consideration be given to provisions, to be inserted in the Covenant or in separate protocols, for the receipt and examination of petitions from individuals and organizations on alleged Covenant violations; and an article be included in the Covenant to make its terms applicable equally to a signatory metropolitan state and to all territories, be they non-self-governing, trust, or colonial, which are being administered or governed by such a state. The Commission was also asked in a General Assembly resolution to study and prepare recommendations on ways and means of insuring the right of peoples and nations to self-determination.

Other subjects on the provisional agenda of the next session of the Commission include (1) the development of the work of the United Nations for wider observance and respect for human rights

and fundamental freedoms throughout the world, (2) annual reports on human rights, (3) the Draft Declaration on the Rights of the Child, (4) an International Court of Human Rights, (5) the continuing validity of minorities treaties and declarations, and (6) the *Yearbook* on Human Rights.

The Commission on Human Rights, which is one of the nine permanent functional commissions of the United Nations Economic and Social Council, advises and assists the Council on all matters relating to the obligation assumed by the members of the United Nations to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion. Eighteen Governments, elected by the Council, comprise the membership of the Commission. Its sixth session was held at Lake Success from March 27-May 19 1950.

Plight of Survivors of Concentration Camps

U.N. doc. E/1974
Adopted Mar. 19, 1951

The Economic and Social Council,

TAKING NOTE of the report received from the Secretary-General in pursuance of Council resolution 305 (XI) adopted on 14 July 1950, on the subject of survivors of concentration camps who, under the Nazi regime, were the victims of so-called scientific experiments,

1. *Appeals* to the competent German authorities to consider making the fullest possible reparation for the injuries suffered, under the Nazi regime, by persons subjected to so-called scientific experiments in concentration camps;

2. *Invites* the International Refugee Organization and any authority which may succeed it in the administration of the Reparations Funds, and voluntary agencies distributing these funds, to alleviate the plight of these victims as far as possible;

3. *Invites* the World Health Organization to assist in the health aspects of the problem;

4. *Requests* the Secretary-General to study the possibility of securing such voluntary support and contributions as may appear necessary to supplement the reparation measures proposed above, if the latter prove inadequate; and

5. *Further requests* the Secretary-General to keep informed of all the measures which may be taken, to seek to ensure that they provide full reparation, and to report to the thirteenth session of the Council on the results of the present resolution.

Forced Labor and Mesurés for Its Abolition

U.N. doc. E/1960
Adopted Mar. 19, 1951

The Economic and Social Council,

RECALLING its previous resolutions on the subject of forced labour and measures for its abolition,

CONSIDERING the replies furnished by Member States to

the communications addressed to them by the Secretary-General in accordance with resolutions 195 (VIII) and 237 (IX),

TAKING NOTE of the communications from the International Labour Organization setting forth the discussions on the question of forced labour at the 111th and 113th sessions of the Governing Body,

CONSIDERING the rules and principles laid down in International Labour Convention No. 29,

RECALLING the principles of the Charter relating to respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,

DEEPLY MOVED by the documents and evidence brought to its knowledge and revealing in law and in fact the existence in the world of systems of forced labour under which a large proportion of the populations of certain States are subjected to a penitentiary regime,

1. *Decides* to invite the International Labour Organization to co-operate with the Council in the earliest possible establishment of an *ad hoc* committee on forced labour of not more than five independent members, qualified by their competence and impartiality, to be appointed jointly by the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Director-General of the International Labour Office with the following terms of reference:

(a) To study the nature and extent of the problem raised by the existence in the world of systems of forced or "corrective" labour, which are employed as a means of political coercion or punishment for holding or expressing political views, and which are on such a scale as to constitute an important element in the economy of a given country, by examining the texts of laws and regulations and their application in the light of the principles referred to above, and, if the Committee thinks fit, by taking additional evidence into consideration;

(b) To report the results of its studies and progress thereon to the Council and to the Governing Body of the International Labour Office; and

2. *Requests* the Secretary-General and the Director-General to supply the professional and clerical assistance necessary to ensure the earliest initiation and effective discharge of the *ad hoc* committee's work.

Water Control and Utilization for Arid Areas

U.N. doc E/1945
Adopted Mar. 9, 1951

The Economic and Social Council,

CONSIDERING the desirability that measures being taken internationally in the general field of water control and utilization should be co-ordinated, and that such co-ordination should be undertaken within the United Nations system, and

CONSIDERING that the General Assembly, in resolution 402 (V), has recommended that the Secretary-General prepare for the examination of the Council at its fourteenth session a report on the practical measures adopted for the study of the problems of arid zones and on the technical and financial means employed by the specialized agencies for this purpose,

1. *Requests* the Secretary-General to take into consideration, in preparing this report, the entire field of water control and utilization as it is related to the problems of arid zones; and

2. *Further requests* the Secretary-General, in consultation with the specialized agencies, to submit a report to the Council on the work being done by the specialized agencies and other international organizations, whether governmental, semi-governmental or non-governmental, engaged in the broad field of water control and utilization.

April 23, 1951

United Nations Documents: A Selected Bibliography¹

Security Council

Letter dated 12 March 1951 from the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization to the Secretary-General transmitting a report on the activities of the Special Committee provided for in the Egyptian-Israeli General Armistice Agreement. S/2047, March 21, 1951. 4 pp. mimeo.

Letter dated 12 March 1951 from the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization to the Secretary-General transmitting a report on decisions taken by the Hashemite Jordan Kingdom-Israel Mixed Armistice Commission. S/2048, March 21, 1951. 15 pp. mimeo.

Letter dated 12 March 1951 from the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization to the Secretary-General transmitting a report on the status of the operations of the Mixed Armistice Commissions. S/2049, March 21, 1951. 13 pp. mimeo.

Economic and Social Council

Plight of Survivors of Concentration Camps. Progress Report by the Secretary-General. E/1915, February 6, 1951. 50 pp. mimeo.

Recommendations Regarding the Agenda of the Twelfth Session of the Council. E/1919, February 17, 1951. 9 pp. mimeo.

Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance; Second Report of the Technical Assistance Committee (First Part). E/1920, February 17, 1951. 7 pp. mimeo.

Letter dated 27 March 1951 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Security Council transmitting the Ninth Progress Report of the United Conciliation Commission for Palestine [A1793]. S/2057, March 27, 1951. 1 p. mimeo.

Methods of Social Welfare Administration. E/CN.5/224, October 25, 1950. 299 pp. printed, \$2.50.

Economic and Social Council; Eleventh Session, 3 July to 16 August 1950 (Geneva) and 12 October to 13 December 1950 (Lake Success). Disposition of Agenda Items. E/INF/40, January 2, 1951. 236 pp. mimeo.

Trusteeship Council

Report [The Ewe Problem] by Mr. Paulin Baptiste, Procurator-General. T/846, February 26, 1951. 28 pp. mimeo.

Department of Public Information Research Section

United Nations Headquarters. Background Paper No. 63. 44 pp. mimeo.

¹ Printed materials may be secured in the United States from the International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N. Y. Other materials (mimeographed or processed documents) may be consulted at certain designated libraries in the United States.

The United Nations Secretariat has established an *Official Records* series for the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, and the Atomic Energy Commission which includes summaries of proceedings, resolutions, and reports of the various commissions and committees. Publications in the *Official Records* series will not be listed in this department as heretofore, but information on securing subscriptions to the series may be obtained from the International Documents Service.

The United States in the United Nations

[April 13-19, 1951]

General Assembly

Additional Measures Committee.—At a meeting on April 18, the subcommittee approved forwarding the following report to the Additional Measures Committee (AMC):

The Additional Measures Committee, at its second meeting of March 8, appointed this sub-committee to consider practical measures and to study priorities. The sub-committee has carefully considered these subjects. There have been numerous consultations and exchanges of views on the general approach which the AMC might use in its studies.

The sub-committee unanimously recommends that, when the Additional Measures Committee pursues the examination of additional measures against the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, it should give priority to the study of economic measures.

Economic and Social Council

Commission on Human Rights.—The 18-member Commission began its seventh session at Geneva on April 16, which will last approximately 6 weeks. The countries represented on the Commission are: Australia, Chile, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, Greece, Guatemala, India, Lebanon, Pakistan, Sweden, Ukrainian, S.S.R., U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, and Yugoslavia.

At the first meeting, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, the United States representative, who has been chairman since the inception of the Commission in 1946, announced that she would not seek reelection as she considered it desirable that no one person and no representative of one state—particularly one of the larger states—should continue too long to preside over international work of the type done by the Commission. She stated she would continue her deep interest in the Commission's work and would continue as the United States member of it. Several members praised Mrs. Roosevelt's work and her contribution to the cause of human rights both within the United Nations and in private life.

Dr. Charles Malik (Lebanon) was nominated by Mrs. Roosevelt to succeed her as chairman. This motion was seconded and he was unanimously elected. The other officers elected were: Prof. Rene Cassin (France), first vice chairman; Mrs. Hansa Mehta (India) second vice chairman; and H. F. W. Whitlam (Australia) rapporteur.

As early as 1946, the Commission considered as its main task the formulation of an International Bill of Human Rights to be composed of three parts. The first of these is the Universal Declara-

tion of Human Rights, which was adopted by the General Assembly in Paris on December 10, 1948. The second part will be a covenant on such specific rights as lend themselves to binding legal obligations. The third, which will set forth measures of implementation, will relate to machinery that might be set up by the United Nations to enforce the provisions of the covenant.

At this session, the Commission will give priority to the completion of the draft International Covenant on Human Rights and Measures of Implementation. In this connection, it will give attention to the resolutions adopted by the fifth session of the General Assembly on December 4, 1950, and, at the twelfth session of the Economic and Social Council on February 23, 1951, which request: (1) that the list of rights in the first 18 articles of the covenant be reexamined to insure the adequacy of that list and to define the rights and limitations; (2) that study be given to the inclusion of a special article to apply the Covenant to federal states; (3) that provision be made to include in the covenant economic, social, and cultural rights and an explicit recognition of the equality of men and women; (4) that separate protocols or covenant provisions be considered for the receipt and study of petitions from individuals and organizations on alleged covenant violations; (5) that an article be included to make the terms of the covenant applicable to all signatory states and their territories, colonies, or dependencies. The Commission was also asked in a General Assembly resolution to study and recommend ways and means of insuring the rights of peoples and nations to self-determination.

Among the other subjects on the agenda are (1) the development of the work of the United Nations for wider observance and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms throughout the world; (2) annual reports on human rights; (3) draft declaration on the rights of the child; (4) old-age rights; (5) an international court of human rights; (6) the continuing validity of minorities treaties and declarations; and (7) the *Yearbook on Human Rights*.

At the end of its session, the Commission will adopt a report on its work to be submitted to the next session of the Economic and Social Council.

Security Council

The Council met on April 17 to consider again the Palestine question since the adoption of the resolution on November 17, 1950, which "expressed the hope that the governments and authorities con-

cerned would at an early date achieve agreement on final settlement of all questions outstanding between them."

In accordance with several communications received by the President of the Security Council from Faris El-Khoury Bey, chairman of the Syrian delegation to the United Nations and Ambassador Abba Eban, permanent delegate of Israel to the United Nations, regarding complaints of violations of the general armistice agreement the following items had been placed on the provisional agenda:

1. Violations of the armistice agreement. (Starting and continuing operations for draining the Huleh swamps within the demilitarized zone against the wishes of Syria, Arab landowners, and United Nations supervisors, thus violating, repeatedly the terms of the armistice agreement and defying the recommendation and advice of the United Nations supervisors.)

2. Military Occupation by Israel of demilitarized zones.

3. Firing on Syrian posts. (Firing of automatic weapons and mortars on Syrian military posts.)

4. Evacuation of Arab inhabitants. (Evacuation of the Arab inhabitants by force within the demilitarized zones.)

5. Bombing and demolishing incidents. (Bombing of Syrian military posts and demolishing of Arab villages on Syrian territory on April 5, 1951.)

6. Complaint of Syrian violation of general armistice agreement between Israel and Syria by persistent firing on civilian workers in the demilitarized zone in Israel territory near Banat Yakub on March 15, 1951, and between March 25 and 28, 1951.

7. Complaints of Syrian violation of general armistice agreement between Israel and Syria by the entry of Syrian armed forces into the demilitarized zone in Israel territory between El Hamma and Khirbeth Tewfig on April 3, 1951.

8. Complaint of Syrian violation of general armistice agreement between Israel and Syria by the action of Syrian armed forces in opening fire on Israel civilian policemen near El Hamma in Israel territory on April 4, 1951, killing seven Israel civilian policemen and wounding three.

Prior to adoption of the agenda, the President stated "there is no *prima facie* value in any item appearing on the provisional agenda. The items are intended only to identify the subject matter." He also called attention to press reports received from the United Nations public information officer with the Palestine Conciliation Commission, Jerusalem, that both Syria and Israel had agreed, April 16 and 12, respectively, on the following four points as a basis for resumption of normal meetings of the Mixed Armistice Commission: "(1) All military and para-military forces of both sides to be withdrawn from the demilitarized zone.

(2) No further fighting within the zone or across demarcation lines. (3) United Nations observers to be afforded every facility for carrying out their duties. (4) The responsibility of the Mixed Armistice Commission Chairman to implement Article 5 of the Armistice Agreement, on the resumption of normal life in the zone, to be reaffirmed."

Mr. El-Khoury stated that Israel had ignored Syria's protests and the warnings of the Mixed Armistice Commission and had entered the militarized zone to begin large-scale drainage works. He cited a series of requests from the Mixed Armistice Commission Chairman to the Israelis to suspend the drainage work, pending an inquiry. Such requests were ignored while Israel moved in armed forces and began mass deportations of Arab inhabitants in the demilitarized zone. As for the legal issues, he declared there was no law of expropriation for the demilitarized zone. Furthermore, the mass deportations of the Arab inhabitants was in open contravention of international law and justice.

The zone was not Israeli territory, nor did either party have sovereignty there. The draining of the Huleh swamp, in itself, was a useful project, Mr. El-Khoury admitted, but his Government opposed the drainage for a variety of reasons, as explained. He stated further that Syrian forces had never fired on United Nations observers as Israel alleged, and the observers themselves had never made such a complaint. In conclusion, he said, it was obvious that the Syrian Government could not remain unconcerned regarding the Huleh drainage project. In addition, the bombing of Syria by the Israeli Government had to be considered an international crime condemned by the Charter and international law.

In a brief reply, Mr. Eban stated that the Israeli complaints had been submitted for two reasons: the circumstances showed a clear breach of the peace by Syrian armed violence; also, the Mixed Armistice Commission (Mac) had been in a state of paralysis and inertia at the time the complaints were filed because of the relationship among its members. He referred to the agreement reached on April 12 between Col. Bennett L. de Ridder, Acting Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, and Israel, and stated, now that the Mac had been reconstituted, it was the proper place for discussion. There could be recourse to the Council from the Mixed Armistice Commission, if needed.

Ambassador Sir Gladwyn Jebb (U.K.), the only other member to speak at this meeting, believed the Council should do its best to establish the facts. For that purpose, it would be advisable to hear evidence from Maj. Gen. W. Riley, Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization.

The President agreed with this suggestion and stated he would invite General Riley to attend the next meeting of the Council.

CONGRESS

Threat of Famine in India Immediate

Statement by Secretary Acheson¹

I shall not impose on the patience of this Committee by repeating the statement in support of food assistance to India which I made before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on February 20.² I should like, however, to make one or two comments to bring that statement up to date.

I discussed with the House Committee the question of the acquisition by India of food grains which might be available in Pakistan. I was hopeful at the time that India and Pakistan would answer this question themselves. They have done so. On February 25, the two countries signed a trade agreement which provides, among other things, for the delivery to India in 1951 of 300,000 tons of Pakistan rice and 25,000 tons of wheat and flour. This acquisition will be included in India's 1951 purchase program of some 4 million tons of food grains and does not affect the need for the additional 2 million tons specially requested from the United States.

I urged before the Foreign Affairs Committee that the grain specially requested from this country should begin to move no later than April 1. The studies of the executive branch of the Government had led us to believe that the Indian food situation would become dangerously critical by midsummer. Events since January 20 have shown that our estimate was overly optimistic. The Indian Government is already finding it exceedingly difficult to maintain the flow of grain to its ration outlets in such disaster-stricken areas as Bihar. The Indian people are becoming increasingly fearful of the threat of famine. The threat is immediate. The first million tons of grain specially requested from us, if it is to arrive in time, should be loaded on ships for India as soon as is humanly possible, and I strongly urge that the Congress enact the necessary legislation.

As the President said on March 29,

... we should provide the first million tons promptly as a grant. We can then explore in greater detail the situation with respect to the remaining million tons.

I am heartened by the fact that the bill before this Committee, S. 872, is sponsored by a bipartisan group of 30 Senators. I am sure that this Committee and the Senate as a whole are aware of the urgency of the Indian need and will act as quickly as possible.

¹ Made before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Apr. 16, and released to the press on the same date.

² BULLETIN of Mar. 12, 1951, p. 424.

THE DEPARTMENT

Reorganization in Bureau of Economic Affairs

[Released to the press April 10]

To meet the new requirements in the field of international economic policy raised by this country's large-scale defense program, the Department of State today announced a reorganization in the Bureau of Economic Affairs.

Effective immediately, the Office of International Trade Policy is abolished.

There is established an Office of International Materials Policy and an Office of Economic Defense and Trade Policy.

The Office of International Materials Policy will take over the functions, personnel, and equipment of the Petroleum Policy Staff, the Food and Agriculture Branch, and the Industrial Materials Branch of the Economic Resources and Security Staff.

It will be the purpose of the Office of International Materials Policy, in cooperation with other agencies of the Government; (1) to develop programs and policies which will insure the harmonization of domestic and foreign emergency economic controls designed to stimulate the production of basic materials in short supply; (2) to assure the widest degree of parallel action in the adoption of conservation measures; (3) to provide for the continued export of goods essential to meet the minimum civilian requirements of other parts of the free world; (4) to assure the availability to the United States adequate supplies of basic materials, and (5) to promote the allocation where necessary of materials in short supply.

The Office of Economic Defense and Trade Policy will take over the functions, personnel, and equipment of the Commercial Policy Staff, the International Business Practices Policy Staff, and the Economic Security Branch of the Economic Resources and Security Staff.

It will be the purpose of the Office of Economic Defense and Trade Policy to promote the strength of the free world through economic ties to prevent inflation and to increase the flow of essential trade. The Office will cooperate with other Government agencies to consolidate and strengthen the framework of international cooperation in the field of trade policy and economic treaty relationships to develop greater political unity and to assure long-run economic stability on which a sustained defense program must rest. The Office also will have authority in the Department's jurisdiction over controls of exports to the Soviet bloc.

Principal Officers

The principal officers in the new units are as follows:

- a. Office of International Materials (OMP)
 - Winthrop G. Brown, acting director
 - John W. Evans, acting deputy director
 - Willis C. Armstrong, acting special assistant
 - Clarence W. Nichols, acting special assistant
- (1) Petroleum Policy Staff (PED)
 - Edwin G. Moline, acting chief
- (2) Manufactured Products Staff (MPS)
- (3) Agricultural Products Staff (APS)
 - Francis A. Linville, acting chief
- (4) Industrial Raw Materials Staff (IRM)
- (5) Metals and Minerals Staff (MMS)
 - Harlan P. Bramble, acting chief
- b. Office of Economic Defense and Trade Policy (EDT)
 - John M. Leddy, acting director
 - Joseph D. Coppock, acting adviser
- (1) Economic Defense Staff (EDS)
- (2) Commercial Policy Staff (CP)
 - Carl D. Corse, acting chief
- (3) Business Practices and Technology Staff (BPT)
 - Roger C. Dixon, acting chief

Mrs. Esther Caukin Brunauer Suspended

[Released to the press April 10]

Deputy Under Secretary Carlisle H. Humelsine announced today that he has ordered the suspension of Mrs. Esther Caukin Brunauer because of information received that the Department of the Navy had suspended her husband, Stephen Brunauer, under Navy Department loyalty and security procedures. Mrs. Brunauer's suspension was taken automatically pending the outcome of the Department of the Navy action concerning Mr. Brunauer. Mrs. Brunauer has been employed by the UNESCO relations staff of the Department of State as a liaison officer.

In announcing this action, Mr. Humelsine made it clear that Mrs. Brunauer's suspension results from action taken by the Navy in regard to her husband and not from any information which has been received concerning her.

Fifth Semiannual Report of Educational Exchange Issue

[Released to the press April 12]

A sharpening of the Department of State's Educational Exchange Program to fulfill the objectives of the Campaign of Truth is reported in the fifth semiannual report of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange.¹

The report, made public today following its submission to Congress, was presented by the Commission Chairman Harvie Branscomb, chancellor of Vanderbilt University. It contains an attach-

¹ H. Doc. 108, 82d Cong. 1st sess.

ment on the cultural penetration of northern Korea by Soviet Russia as an example of the need for shifting the emphasis in the operation of the exchange program in many parts of the world.

The report comments,

This provides a vivid illustration of a Soviet program to misguide and seduce a whole population for violent ends.

The Commission recommends increased activities in the international exchange of labor leaders—more scholarships at workers' education centers, more study tours of trade unionists, and special summer classes to study social problems in various countries.

The report further comments,

Communist propaganda is aimed at workers who constitute a large and important part of the world's population. The United States must combat this influence to win the workers' support.

Our task must be to depict the true status of workers in the U.S.S.R. and in Soviet satellite countries in contrast to the position of labor in the United States where workers have economic security, dignity, self-respect, and recognition without recourse to class warfare and dictatorship which the Communist doctrine holds to be necessary before workers can attain their rights.

The report notes that organized American labor has developed a technical assistance program through the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions [ICFTU]. Among the many projects initiated by the ICFTU, the report notes, is the establishment of training schools in Asia to develop leaders for free trade unions.

Reviewing Soviet activities in North Korea, the report detailed widespread cultural penetration during the 5 years preceding the outbreak of hostilities. This included the enrollment of over 1,300,000 North Koreans in Soviet-oriented cultural societies, the translation and publication of over 500 Russian books, the organization of Russian-language courses, and thousands of lectures and concerts. Hundreds of intellectual, industrial, and political leaders were taken to Moscow for indoctrination.

The report said, in commenting on the expansion of the program:

While the Communist educational and cultural program in north Korea was exceptional in its intensity, similar efforts in other countries called for a re-thinking and re-direction of United States educational exchange objectives during the last year.

Major steps considered by the Commission were listed as (1) shaping the program to fit each country, and (2) sharpening the objectives of the program. Under the second point, the Commission cited the following three specific objectives to be carried out in collaboration with the international information program:

a. To keep alive the spirit of cooperation among the free nations of the world for the purpose of self-protection and progress for all.

b. To strengthen resistance to Communism in countries immediately threatened with infiltration or aggression.

c. To weaken the forces of Communism and diminish its power in areas now under the domination of the U.S.S.R.

The Commission noted a growth in the number of exchange grants from 450 in 1948 to an estimated 6,500 for 1951. With 30,000 foreign students now studying at a thousand American campuses, it was pointed out that the Government program is relatively small compared to the exchange activities carried out under private auspices.

In a summary appraisal, the Commission stated:

The expansion of the educational exchange program to many new countries, its rapid increase in volume, and its redirection to meet the challenge of Communist propaganda and subversion have placed heavy burdens upon the administrators of the program throughout this three-year period. The responsibilities have been particularly great this past year when, with the initiation of the President's Campaign of Truth, most of the expansion and change has taken place. It is the opinion of this Commission that, on the whole, the job has been well done.

The Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, Edward W. Barrett, has given the program vigorous and forward-looking leadership. Obviously, we cannot pass judgment on the capabilities of all the officers he has selected to carry on the work of the program here and overseas. The progress of the program, however, convinces us that he has brought together an excellent staff and, in our various contacts with the program officers here and overseas, we have noted their devotion and enthusiasm for their jobs.

Noting recent proposals to remove the information and educational exchange program from the Department of State, the majority of the Commission expressed its belief that the educational exchange program should remain in the Department of State.

The membership of the Commission, in addition to Dr. Branscomb, includes:

Vice Chairman—Mark Starr, educational director of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union
Harold Willis Dodds, president, Princeton University
Edwin B. Fred, president, University of Wisconsin
Martin R. P. McGuire, professor, Catholic University

PUBLICATIONS

Recent Releases

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

Passport Visa Fees. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 1990. Pub. 3709. 2 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Greece—
Effected by exchange of notes dated at Athens March 4 and July 22, 1949; entered into force July 22, 1949.

Some Facts About the Foreign Service, April 1, 1950. Department and Foreign Service Series, 16. Pub. 3789. 70 pp. 20¢.

A short account of its organization and duties together with pertinent laws and regulations.

Termination of Reciprocal Trade Agreement of May 18, 1936. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2083. Pub. 3916. 2 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Finland—
Signed at Helsinki January 18, 1950; entered into force January 18, 1950.

Vocational Industrial Education. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2115. Pub. 4018. 25 pp. 10¢.

Agreements between the United States and Brazil extending and amending agreement of January 3, 1946—Effected by exchange of notes signed at Rio de Janeiro August 23 and September 29, 1949; entered into force October 4, 1949, operative retroactively from June 30, 1948 and Exchange of notes signed at Rio de Janeiro July 23 and October 21 and 27, 1948; entered into force October 30, 1948, operative retroactively from June 30, 1948.

Economic Cooperation With Burma. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2128. Pub. 4022. 17 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States and Burma—
Signed at Rangoon September 13, 1950; entered into force October 10, 1950, and Exchange of notes—
Signed at Rangoon September 13, 1950.

Claims. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2129. Pub. 4027. 10 pp. 5¢.

Convention between the United States and Panama—
Signed at Panamá January 26, 1950; entered into force October 11, 1950.

Finance: Expenditures by Forces Under Command of the Commanding General Armed Forces of the Member States of the United Nations. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2135. Pub. 4038. 12 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Korea superseding agreement of July 6, 1950—Signed at Taegu July 28, 1950; entered into force July 28, 1950 and Exchange of notes—Signed September 3 and 5, 1950.

The "Point Four" Program. Economic Cooperation Series 25. Pub. 4042. 10 pp. Free.

Progress report No. 5. The fifth in a series of progress reports on the Point Four Program designed to provide background information in summary form on developments in the President's program for world economic progress through cooperative technical assistance.

Passport Visas. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2137. Pub. 4043. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Chile—
Effected by exchange of notes signed at Santiago August 29, 1950; entered into force September 1, 1950.

Technical Cooperation. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2138. Pub. 4044. 5 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Ceylon—
Signed at Colombo November 7, 1950; entered into force November 7, 1950.

Air Transport Services. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2131. Pub. 4047. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Spain amending agreement of December 2, 1944.

Air Transport Services. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2132. Pub. 4048. 3 pp. 5¢

Agreement between the United States and Spain amending agreement of December 2, 1944 as amended—Effected by exchange of *notes verbales* dated at Madrid February 21, and March 12, 1946; entered into force March 12, 1946.

Passport Visas: United States Citizens Visiting Southern Rhodesia; British Subjects Residents of Southern Rhodesia Visiting the United States. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2141. Pub. 4055. 2 pp. 5¢.

Arrangement between the United States and the United Kingdom—Effected by exchange of notes dated at Washington August 26 and September 13, 1950; entered into force September 13, 1950.

Germany: Retention in Germany or Removal as Reparations of German Industrial Plants. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2142. Pub. 4056. 6 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and United Kingdom and France—Signed at London March 31, 1949; entered into force April 8, 1949.

Aviation: Flights of Military Aircraft. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2143. Pub. 4057. 6 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and the Dominican Republic—Effected by exchange of notes signed at Ciudad Trujillo August 11, 1950; entered into force August 11, 1950.

Mutual Defense Assistance. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2145. Pub. 4059. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Yugoslavia—Effected by exchange of notes signed at Belgrade November 20 and 21, 1950; entered into force November 21, 1950.

Emergency Food Assistance: Publicity for Distribution Program. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2146. Pub. 4060. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Yugoslavia—Effected by exchange of notes signed at Belgrade November 17 and 21, 1950; entered into force November 21, 1950.

Passport Visa Fees. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2144. Pub. 4061. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and Greece—Effected by exchange of notes dated at Athens January 7 and 29, 1949; entered into force January 29, 1949.

Foreign Service List, January 1, 1951. Pub. 4069. 200 pp. 40¢ a copy. Subscription price, \$1.50 a year; \$2 foreign.

Includes the posts of assignment, consular districts, tariff of Foreign Service fees, index of persons, and geographic index.

Finance: Repayment of Funds Advanced to the National Defense Forces, Republic of the Philippines, by the United States Philippines-Ryukyus Command. Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2151. Pub. 4070. 7 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines—Signed at Washington November 6, 1950; entered into force November 6, 1950.

Telling America's Story Abroad. International Information and Cultural Series 14. Pub. 4075. 28 pp. 15¢.

The State Department's Information and Educational Exchange Program.

Reorganization on the Department of State Implementing the Recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Department and Foreign Service Series 22. Pub. 4106. 6 pp. Free.

Reprint from BULLETIN of January 1, 1951.

Recent Soviet Pressures on Germany. European and British Commonwealth Series 18. Revised. Pub. 4123. 4 pp. Free.

A background summary.

Unity of Purpose Urged for Security of North Atlantic Area. General Foreign Policy Series 42. Pub. 4129. 18 pp. Free.

Report of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, to Members of Congress, February 1, 1951.

The Road Ahead in Collective Defense of Free Nations. General Foreign Policy Series 44. Pub. 4134. 5 pp. Free.

Excerpts from an address by Ambassador Warren R. Austin before the Association of American Colleges at Atlantic City, N.J., on January 9, 1951. Reprint from BULLETIN of January 29, 1951.

It Has Fallen to Us. General Foreign Policy Series 45. Pub. 4144. 8 pp. Free.

A letter from the Secretary of State on the meaning of Korea.

Laying Foundations for Peace in the Pacific. Far Eastern Series 39. Pub. 4148. 12 pp. Free.

Address by John Foster Dulles over the Columbia Broadcasting System network on March 1, 1951.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Instructions Issued to Foreign Service Posts on the Internal Security Act

[Released to the press April 14]

Following are the operating instructions sent to all American diplomatic and consular officers re the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by the Internal Security Act of 1950 and the Clarification Act of March 28, 1951, pending the issuance of formal regulations.

1. The President approved on March 28, 1951 an Act of Congress (Public Law 14, 82d Congress) which requires a change in the interpretation of the provisions of the Act of October 16, 1918, as amended by the Internal Security Act of 1950.

2. Section 1 of the Act of March 28, 1951 reads:

That the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to provide by regulations that the terms "members of" and "affiliated with" where used in the Act of October 16, 1918, as amended, shall include only membership or affiliation which is or was voluntary, and shall not include membership or affiliation which is or was solely (a) when under sixteen years of age, (b) by operation of law, or (c) for purposes of obtaining employment, food rations, or other essentials of living, and where necessary for such purposes.

3. The committee report in connection with the legislation contains the following statements:

The reason most frequently given for the denial of visas or the denial of admission appears to be the applicants' past membership of, or affiliation with, certain totalitarian youth, national labor, or professional, student, or similar organizations, or the alien's service in the German or Italian Armies, or his involuntary membership in totalitarian parties or their affiliates and auxiliaries, including those cases where it was shown that such membership or affiliation occurred by operation of law or edict, or for purposes of obtaining or preserving employment, food rations, or other essentials of living.

The bill makes clear the intent of Congress that aliens who are, or were, voluntary members of the Nazi, Fascist, or other totalitarian parties or organizations are to be excluded, but aliens who were involuntary members of Nazi, Fascist, or other totalitarian youth, national labor, student, or similar organizations, are not to be considered ipso facto as members of, or affiliated with, the Nazi, Fascist, or other totalitarian parties or organizations within the meaning of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended. Furthermore, aliens who served in the German, Italian or other armed forces are not to be considered ipso facto as members of, or affiliated with, the Nazi, Fascist, or other totalitarian parties or subsidiary organizations.

4. All cases of visa applicants in which adverse action was taken under the Act of October 16, 1918, as amended by the Internal Security Act of 1950, should be reviewed in the light of the Act of March 28, 1951. Visas may now be issued in such cases if they were previously withheld solely on one or more of the grounds which no longer exist, as provided in the Act of March 28, 1951.

5. Visas may now be granted in all bona fide nonimmigrant cases now pending before the Department, or the Department of Justice, for ninth proviso action which was deemed to be necessary under the Attorney General's construction of the law, but which now clearly do not fall within the intent of Congress as stated in the Act of March 28, 1951, and in all such cases arising henceforth. The Department should be promptly informed of any pending cases which are still considered to require ninth proviso action.

6. Immigration visas may be issued to aliens whose cases had been suspended solely upon the basis of former involuntary membership in the Nazi, Fascist, Falangist or Communist party or an affiliate, subsidiary, section, branch, or subdivision of those parties, and in all such cases arising henceforth.

7. The admission of aliens who are, or were, Nazis or Fascists at heart, or who advocate the Falangist system for the United States, is to be considered prejudicial to the interests of the United States within the meaning of the war-time visa regulations contained in Supplement D to the Foreign Service Regulations (22 CFR 53.1-53.41).

8. Aliens who are, or were, voluntary members of, or voluntarily affiliated with, the parties or organizations proscribed by the Act of October 16, 1918, as amended, are still excludable.

9. The principal parties proscribed by the Act of October 16, 1918, as amended by the Internal Security Act of 1950, are:

(a) Every Communist party in the world, which includes every party that has ever been a part of the world Communist movement directed from the U. S. S. R., regardless of the name by which it may be, or have been, known; the Nazi Party (N. S. D. A. P.) of Germany; the Fascist Party (P. N. F.) of Italy; and the Falange (F. E. T.) of Spain. The proscription of the statute also applies to any other party which is or was a "totalitarian dictatorship" as defined in Section 3 (15) of the Internal Security Act of 1950. No party other than those specifically designated has been so designated up to the present time.

(b) Every section, subsidiary, branch, or sub-division (which are to be regarded as synonymous terms) of such parties is also within the statutory proscription. Every direct predecessor or successor party or organization, having the same general ideological objectives or purposes, of such parties is also within the statutory proscription.

(c) Every "affiliate" (affiliated organization) of such parties is also within the statutory proscription. The term "affiliate" as here used means an organization substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by one of the parties within the statutory proscription, which is or was used or operated by such party primarily to help maintain its totalitarian control over the country, or to help disseminate its totalitarian economic and governmental doctrines or ideology.

(d) Considering the Nazi Party of Germany as an example, the (SS) Schutzstaffeln (Protective Squad—Elite Guard), the (SA) Sturmabteilung (Storm Detachment), the (NSKK) NS Kraftfahrerkorps (Motor Corps), the (NSFK) NS Fliegerkorps (Flying Corps), the (HJ) Hitler Jugend (Hitler Youth), and the (BDM) Bund Deutscher (League of German Girls) may be regarded as sections, subsidiaries, branches, or subdivisions of the Party. The (DAF) Deutsche Arbeitsfront (German Labor Front), the (NSV) NS Volkswohlfahrt (Peoples Welfare Service), and the (RAD) Reichsarbeitsdienst (Compulsory National Labor Service) were "affiliates" of the Party.

(e) Where used in this circular airgram, the term "proscribed party or organization" means all of the aforementioned Communist and other totalitarian parties, their sections, subsidiaries, branches and subdivisions, their direct predecessor and successor parties or organizations, and their "affiliates". Where "affiliates" are separately treated it is intended to cover only affiliated organizations which are or were not sections, subsidiaries, branches, or subdivisions of such proscribed parties.

10. (a) Service, whether voluntary or not, in the armed forces of any country shall not be regarded, of itself, as membership in, or affiliation with, any proscribed party or organization, and shall not, of itself, constitute a ground for exclusion. This, however, in no way affects the prohibition contained in Section 13 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, against the issuance of a visa under that Act to any person who has voluntarily borne arms against the United States on the western front during World War II except that the construction of the word "voluntary" as used in this circular airgram shall be applied to the construction of the word "voluntarily" appearing in Section 13 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, in relation to bearing arms, but only by other than German nationals.

(b) Voluntary service in a political capacity (such as a political commissar) with the armed forces of any country shall constitute affiliation with a proscribed party or organization.

11. Membership or affiliation, whether voluntary or not, which ended before an alien reached his

sixteenth birthday shall not constitute a ground for exclusion. If an alien continues or continued his membership or affiliation beyond his sixteenth birthday, the question whether his membership or affiliation after his sixteenth birthday is or was voluntary shall be determined as in the case of any other alien. In that connection, the facts relating to his activities only after his sixteenth birthday may be considered in determining whether the continuation of his membership or affiliation is or was voluntary.

12. Membership or affiliation solely by operation of law shall not constitute a ground for exclusion. This "operation of law" exception includes any case wherein the alien automatically becomes or became a member or affiliate of a proscribed party or organization by official act, proclamation, order or decree.

13. The term "voluntary" when used in relation to membership in, or affiliation with, a proscribed party or organization shall be construed to mean membership or affiliation which is or was knowingly created by the alien's act of joining or affiliating, upon his own volition, with such proscribed party or organization. It does not include:

(a) Membership or affiliation which is or was solely the result of duress or coercion;

(b) Membership or affiliation which is or was solely, and necessary, for the purpose of obtaining or keeping employment, food rations, housing, or other essentials of living, such as general education;

(c) Membership or affiliation in a non-proscribed party or organization, which membership or affiliation continues or continued after such party or organization becomes or became proscribed, or comes or came under the domination or control of a proscribed party or organization, provided that the alien establishes that he cannot or could not have terminated his membership or affiliation without suffering loss of employment, housing, food rations, or other essentials of living, such as general education. However, a person who terminates or terminated his membership or affiliation in a party or organization prior to the date it becomes or became proscribed, or comes or came under the domination or control of a proscribed party or organization, shall not be considered to be or to have been a member or affiliate of a proscribed party or organization;

(d) Membership in or affiliation with an "affiliate", where the alien establishes that at the time he voluntarily joined the "affiliate", it professed a purpose neither Communist nor totalitarian in character, provided the alien establishes that at the time of joining he did not know, and did not have reasonable means of ascertaining, that the "affiliate" had any purpose Communist or totalitarian in character, and that he continues or continued to have no knowledge of, and no reasonable means of ascertaining, the proscribed purpose of the "affiliate", up until the time his membership or affilia-

tion ceases or ceased, or that after he ascertains or ascertained the proscribed purpose of the "affiliate", he is or was not able to terminate his membership or affiliation without suffering loss of employment, housing, food rations, or other essentials of living, such as general education.

14. In all cases under paragraphs 12 and 13 above, the responsible consular officer must be satisfied that the alien did not, in whole or in part, join or remain a member or affiliate because of ideological conviction or belief in the doctrines of Communism or other form of totalitarianism, and that he has never intentionally been active in the promotion of such doctrines.

15. (a) Membership in, or direct (i. e., not through any intermediary "affiliate") affiliation with, any Communist Party, the Nazi Party, the Fascist Party, the Spanish Falange, or other totalitarian party, or any section, subsidiary, branch, or subdivision thereof, including the youth groups under any Communist Party (where the membership or affiliation is or was after the alien's sixteenth birthday)—as distinguished from an "affiliate" or youth group comprehended within (b), below—shall be considered prima facie to be or to have been voluntary, and the burden shall be on the alien to prove by clear and convincing evidence, which shall be made a matter of record in the case, that such membership or direct affiliation is or was involuntary.

(b) Membership in, or affiliation with, an "affiliate" of any Communist Party, the Nazi Party, the Fascist Party, the Spanish Falange, or other totalitarian party, or membership in, or affiliation with, the youth sections of the Nazi Party, the Fascist Party, the Spanish Falange, or other totalitarian party (where the membership or affiliation is or was after the alien's sixteenth birthday), except youth groups under any Communist party, shall be regarded as raising an inference that such membership or affiliation is or was voluntary, but this inference may be overcome by the alien's sworn statement that his membership or affiliation is or was involuntary, provided that, after appropriate security clearances, there is no evidence or reliable information to the contrary. If any such evidence or information to the contrary is obtained, the burden shall continue to be on such alien to establish by clear and convincing evidence, which shall be made a matter of record in the case, that his membership or affiliation is or was involuntary. Officers of the "affiliates" and youth sections referred to in this subsection shall be considered under (a) above.

16. Doubtful cases of immigrants and nonimmigrants should be submitted to the Department for advisory opinions. All cases of members or former members of the Communist Party or any of its sections, branches, subdivisions or subsidiaries as distinguished from nonofficer members of an affiliate thereof, shall be considered to be doubtful for this purpose.

Africa	Page	Mutual Aid and Defense	Page
Libya—Symbol of Hope for a New Era (Clark, Shaqishli)	643	Assisting Iran To Unite With the Free World	657
Agriculture		Publications	
U.S. Aid to Iran in Fight Against Locusts	661	5th Semiannual Report of U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange Issued	675
Aid to Foreign Countries		Recent Releases	676
U.S.S.R.: U.S. Reiterates Demand on Lend-Lease Settlement	646	Refugees and Displaced Persons	
Asia		Instructions to Foreign Service on the Internal Security Act	677
INDIA: Threat of Famine Immediate (Acheson, Cong. testimony)	674	Plight of Survivors of Concentration Camps, Text of Resolution	670
IRAN:		State, Department of	
Assisting Iran To Unite With the Free World (McGhee, Mathews, Loftus, Burns)	657	Reorganization: Bureau of Economic Affairs	674
Joint Communiqué on U.S.-U.K. Talks	661	Suspension: Mrs. Esther Caukin Brunauer	675
U.S. Aid to Iran in Fight Against Locusts	661	Technical Cooperation and Development	
IRAQ: Point 4 Agreement Signed	653	Assisting Iran To Unite With the Free World	657
ISRAEL: VOA Programs Inaugurated	653	Agreement With Iraq	653
JAPAN: Ambassador Dulles Returns for Peace Treaty Consultation	654	U.S. Aid to Iran in Fight Against Locusts	661
JORDAN: Admiral Robert B. Carney Visits	661	Water Control and Utilization of Arid Areas, Text of Resolution	671
KOREA:		Telecommunications	
Croices Confronting Us in Korea (Rusk over NBC)	655	U.S.-Germany Discuss Agreement for VOA German Language Programs (Sargeant)	652
U.N. Casualties	656	Trade	
American Republics		Costa Rica-U.S. Agreement Terminated	662
COSTA RICA: Trade Agreement Terminated	662	Treaties and Other International Agreements	
Arms and Armed Forces		Compulsory Jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice (Myers)	664
U.N. Casualties in Korea	656	COSTA RICA: Trade Agreement (1936) Terminated. Exchange of Notes, Texts	662
Claims		IRAQ: Point 4 Agreement Signed	653
Deadline for Filing War Claims With Italy	651	JAPAN: Ambassador Dulles Returns for Peace Treaty Consultation	654
Communism		LEND-LEASE (1942): U.S. Reiterates Demand to U.S.S.R. Exchange of Notes, Texts	646
Choices Confronting Us in Korea (Rusk over NBC)	655	VOA: U.S.-Germany Discuss Programs (Sargeant)	652
Educational Exchange Program, 5th Semiannual Report Issued	675	United Nations	
Congress		Casualties of U.N. Forces in Korea	656
Analysis of Official Personnel Stationed in the U.S. and U.S.S.R.: Text of Letter (McFall to Lane)	649	Compulsory Jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice—Additions Through March 31 (Myers)	664
INDIA: Threat of Famine Immediate (Acheson, Cong. testimony)	674	Effect of Revised Monetary Law on U.N. Nationals	651
Instructions Issued to Foreign Service on Internal Security Act	677	Libya—Symbol of Hope for a New Era. (Clark, Shaqishli)	643
Legislation Listed	645	Resolutions:	
Europe		Forced Labor and Measures for Abolition (Mar. 19), Text	670
Instructions Issued to Foreign Service on Internal Security Act	677	Plight of Survivors of Concentration Camps (Mar. 19), Text	670
GERMANY:		Water Control and Utilization for Arid Areas (Mar. 9), Text	671
Discussion of Agreement for VOA Language Programs (Sargeant)	652	Secretary-General Advised of Change in U.N. Command	654
Effect of Revised Monetary Reform Law on U.N. Nationals	651	U.N. Bibliography: Selected Documents	671
U.S. Women To Visit	652	U.S. in U.N. (Weekly Summary)	672
ITALY: Deadline for Filing War Claims	651		
U.K.:		Name Index	
Death of Ernest Bevin (Acheson)	663	Acheson, Secretary Dean	647, 663, 674
Joint Communiqué on U.S.-U.K. Iranian Talks	661	Austin, Warren R.	654
U.S.S.R.:		Bevin, Ernest	663
Analysis of Official Personnel: Text of Letter (McFall to Lane)	649	Branscomb, Harvie	675
U.S. Reiterates Demand on Lend-Lease Settlement: Exchange of Notes, Texts	646	Brown, Winthrop G.	675
Finance		Brunauer, Esther C.	675
Effect of Revised German Monetary Reform Law on U.N. Nationals	651	Burns, Norman	659
Foreign Service		Carney, Robert B.	661
Analysis of Official Personnel Stationed in the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.	649	Clark, Lewis	643
Instructions Issued on Internal Security Act	677	Crocker, Edward S.	653
Libya—Symbol of Hope for a New Era in North Africa. Exchange of Remarks	643	Dulles, John F.	654
Human Rights		Lane, Thomas J.	649
Seventh Session, U.S. Delegation	670	Leddy, John M.	675
Forced Labor and Measure for Abolition, Text of Resolution	670	Lie, Trygvie	654
Information and Educational Exchange Program		Loftus, John	659
Educational Exchange Program, 5th Semiannual Report Issued	675	Mann, Thomas C.	663
VOA:		Mathews, Elbert G.	658
German Language Programs (Sargeant)	652	McFall, Jack K.	649
Israeli Programs Inaugurated	653	McGhee, George C.	657, 660
International Meetings		Myers, Denys P.	664
U.S. Delegation: 7th Session Human Rights	670	Oreamuno, J. Rafael	662
U.S. Women To Visit Germany	652	Panyushkin, A.	648
		Roosevelt, Mrs. Franklin D.	670
		Rusk, Dean	655
		Sargeant, Howland H.	653
		Shaqishli, Muhammad	643
		Suwaidi, Tewfiq	653
		Webb, James E.	654